

# FRACTURE AND STRENGTH OF GLASSES AND GLASS FIBRES CONTAINING BISMUTH AND SILVER DISPERSOIDS

By

ANURADHA VENKATESWARAN



INTERDISCIPLINARY PROGRAMME IN MATERIALS SCIENCE  
INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY KANPUR  
AUGUST, 1979

FRACTURE AND STRENGTH OF  
GLASSES AND GLASS FIBRES CONTAINING  
BISMUTH AND SILVER DISPERSOIDS

A Thesis Submitted  
In Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements  
for the Degree of  
MASTER OF TECHNOLOGY

By  
ANURADHA VENKATESWARAN

to the

INTERDISCIPLINARY PROGRAMME IN MATERIALS SCIENCE  
INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY KANPUR  
AUGUST, 1979

I.I.T. KANPUR  
CENTRAL LIBRARY

Acc. No. **A** 59552

15 SEP 1979

MSP-1979-M-VEN-FRA

*to*

*my parents*

CERTIFICATE


This is to certify that this work entitled 'Fracture and Strength of Glasses and Glass Fibres Containing Bismuth and Silver Dispersoids' by Ms. Anuradha Venkateswaran has been carried out under my supervision and that it has not been submitted elsewhere for a degree.



D. Chakravorty

Professor

Departments of Metallurgical Engg. and  
Materials Science  
Indian Institute of Technology,  
Kanpur



### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am extremely grateful to Dr. D. Chakravorty for his unstinting and excellent guidance throughout the course of this work.

My thanks are due to Mr. B. Sharma, Mr. Nar Singh, Mr. Samar Das, Mr. U. P. Malaviya, Mr. R. K. Prasad and Mr. V. P. Vohra for prompt help rendered whenever necessary.

I am very much obliged to Mr. Devendra Kumar, Mr. B. P. Kashyap, Mr. Syamal Chakrabarti, Mr. G. C. Das and Mr. Yogesh Chandra for helping with the experimentation.

I would also like to acknowledge the help rendered by Mr. M. H. Rehman, Mr. D. K. Sarkar, Mr. O. P. Bajaj and Mr. K. P. Mukherjee.

Thanks are due to Mr. N. Ahmad for his excellent typing, to Mr. V. P. Gupta for the superb drawings and to Mr. Vishwanath Singh for the cyclostyling.

## CONTENTS

<u>Chapter</u>		<u>Page</u>
	LIST OF TABLES	
	LIST OF FIGURES	
	LIST OF PHOTOGRAPHS	
	SYNOPSIS	
1.	INTRODUCTION	1
	1.1 Dispersion Strengthened Glasses: Production	2
	1.2 Theories of Dispersion Strengthening	3
	1.3 Glasses Containing Bismuth and Silver	9
	1.4 Glass Fibres	11
2..	OBJECTIVES OF STUDY	13
3.	EXPERIMENTAL	15
	3.1 Preparation of Glass	15
	3.2 Conversion of Bulk Glass to Glass Fibre	16
	3.3 Ultimate Tensile Strength and Young's Modulus of Fibres	17
	3.4 Rupture Modulus and Young's Modulus in Bending of Bulk Glass	20
	3.5 Microstructure of Glasses and Glass Fibres by Transmission Electron Microscopy	22
	3.6 Preparation of Fracture Surface Replicas for TEM Studies.	23
	3.7 X-Ray Diffraction Studies of Crystalliz- ed Glasses and Crystallized Glass Fibres	25

Chapter	Page
3.8 Microstructural Studies by Optical Microscopy.	26
3.9 Differential Thermal Analysis (DTA), Thermogravimetry (TG) and Derivative Thermogravimetry (DTG).	27
4. RESULTS	29
4.1 Differential Thermal Analysis of Glasses 1 to 5.	29
4.2 Ultimate Tensile Strengths and Young's Moduli of Glass Fibres	29
4.3 Rupture Modulus and Young's Modulus in Bending of Bulk Glasses	30
4.4 X-Ray Diffraction Analysis of Glasses and Glass Fibres	31
4.5 Microstructure by Optical Microscopy.	32
4.6 Microstructure of Glasses and Glass Fibres by TEM studies	33
4.7 Fracture Surface Replicas	34
5. DISCUSSION	36
5.1 DTA Curves	36
5.2 Ultimate Tensile Strength and Young's Modulus of Fibres	36
5.3 Rupture Modulus and Young's Modulus in Bending for Bulk Glass	38
5.4 X-Ray Diffraction Analysis	40
5.5 Optical Microscopy	41
5.6 TEM Studies for Characterization of the Microstructure of Glasses and Glass Fibres	42
5.7 Fracture Surface Replicas	45
6. CONCLUSIONS	99
REFERENCES	102



## LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
3.1A	Table of Glass Compositions	47
3.1B	Glass Melting and Fibre Drawing Parameters	48
4.1	Glass Transition Temperatures of Glasses 1 to 9	49
4.201	Ultimate Tensile Strengths (UTS) and Young's Modulus (E) of Glass 1 fibres of 2.0 cm gage length	50
4.202	UTS and E of Glass 2 fibres of 2.0 cm gage length	51
4.203	UTS and E of Glass 3 fibres of 2.0 cm gage length	53
4.204	UTS and E of Glass 4 fibres of 2.0 cm gage length	55
4.205	UTS and E of Glass 5 fibres of 2.0 cm gage length	56
4.206	UTS and E of Glass 6 fibres of 2.0 cm gage length	57
4.207	UTS and E of Glass 7 fibres of 2.0 cm gage length	58
4.208	UTS and E of Glass 8 fibres of 2.0 cm gage length	59
4.209	UTS and E of Glass 9 fibres of 2.0 cm gage length	60
4.210	UTS and E of Glass 9 fibres using Optical Microscope Measurements	61
4.211	UTS and E of Glass 7 fibres of 5.0 cm gage length	62

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
4.212 UTS and E of Glass 9 fibres of 5.0 cm gage length	63
4.31 Rupture Moduli and Young's Moduli in bending of glasses 1,2,4 and 8	64
4.32 Rupture Moduli and Young's Moduli in bending of glasses 5,6,7 and 9.	65
4.41 X-Ray Diffraction data for glasses 6 and 7 and glass fibres 7	67
4.61 Volume fractions particle sizes and mean free paths for crack propagation in glasses 1,2 and 4 and glass fibres 1 to 4	68
4.62 SAD analysis for glass 7	69
4.63 SAD analysis for glass 2 fibres	70
4.64 SAD analysis for glass 5 fibres	70
4.65 SAD analysis for glass 6 fibres	71
4.66 ASTM data for Bisauth	72
4.67 ASTM data for silver and calcium magnesium silicate	73

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure		Page
3.2	Schematic of fibre drawing assembly and design of bushing used.	74
3.4	Jig used in 3-pt. bending tests on Bulk glass specimens.	75
4.1	A and B: DTA curves for glasses 1 to 9	76
4.21	Histograms of UTS and E values for glass 1 fibres of 2.0 cm gage length	78
4.22	Histograms of UTS and E values for glass 2 fibres of 2.0 cm gage length	79
4.23	Histograms of UTS and E values for glass 3 fibres of 2.0 cm gage length	80
4.24	Histograms of UTS and E values for glass 4 fibres of 2.0 cm gage length	81
4.25	Histograms of UTS and E values for glass 5 fibres of 2.0 cm gage length	82
4.26	Histograms of UTS and E values for glass 6 fibres of 2.0 cm gage length	83
4.27	Histograms of UTS and E values for glass 7 fibres of 2.0 cm gage length	84
4.28	Histograms of UTS and E values for glass 8 fibres of 2.0 cm gage length	85
4.29	Histograms of UTS and E values for glass 9 fibres of 2.0 cm gage length	86
4.31	Typical stress-strain curve for bulk glass sample broken in 3-pt. bending	87
4.41	X-Ray diffraction pattern for glass 6	88
4.42	X-Ray diffraction pattern for glass 7	89
4.43	X-Ray diffraction pattern for glass 7 fibres	90
5.61	UTS versus root of inverse mean free path for glasses 1,2,3,4 and 8	91

## LIST OF PHOTOGRAPHS

<u>Photographs.</u>	<u>Page</u>
4.51      Optical micrograph of crystallized glass 6	92
4.52      Optical micrograph of crystallized glass 7	92
4.53      Optical micrograph of glass 5 fibre	92
4.54      Optical micrographs of glass 6 fibre	92
4.55      Optical micrograph of glass 7 fibre	92
4.601     TEM photograph of microstructure of glass 1	93
4.602     TEM photograph of microstructure of glass 2	93
4.603     TEM photograph of microstructure of glass 4	93
4.604     TEM photograph of microstructure of glass 1 fibres	93
4.605     TEM photograph of microstructure of glass 2 fibres	93
4.606     TEM photograph of microstructure of glass 3 fibres	93
4.607     TEM photograph of microstructure of glass 4 fibres	94
4.608     TEM photograph of microstructure of glass 5	94
4.609     TEM photograph of microstructure of glass 6	94
4.610     TEM photograph of microstructure of glass 7	94
4.611     TEM photograph of microstructure of glass 5 fibres	94
4.612     TEM photograph of microstructure of glass 6 fibres	94
4.613     TEM photograph of microstructure of glass 7 fibres	95

<u>Photographs</u>	<u>Page</u>
4.614 TEM photograph of microstructure of glass 9 fibres	95
4.615 SAD pattern of glass 2 fibres	95
4.616 SAD pattern of glass 5 fibres	96
4.617 SAD pattern of glass 6 fibres	96
4.618 SAD pattern of glass 9 fibres	95
4.619 SAD pattern of glass 7	95
4.701-703 Fracture surface replicas of Glass 1, showing surface roughness	97
4.704 Fracture surface replica of Glass 7, showing surface roughness	97
4.705 Fracture surface replica revealing cracks in Glass 8	97
4.706 Surface topography of Glass 8	97
4.707 Surface topography of Glass 8	98
4.708 Surface topography of Glass 9	98
4.709 Fracture steps in Glass 6	98
4.710 Fracture steps in Glass 7	98

### SYNOPSIS

This is a study of the effect on the fracture and strength of glass compositions in the systems  $\text{SiO}_2\text{-B}_2\text{O}_3\text{-Al}_2\text{O}_3\text{-K}_2\text{O}$  and  $\text{SiO}_2\text{-CaO-MgO-Na}_2\text{O-As}_2\text{O}_3$  due to the incorporation of Bismuth and silver dispersoids respectively.

In the Bismuth glass series the Rupture Modulus and Young's Modulus in bending for bulk glass containing metal are higher than those of the base glass. Tensile strengths and Young's Moduli of Bismuth containing glass fibres are also higher than values for the base glass fibres. Strengthening is attributed to modulus enhancement and flaw size limitation by the dispersoids. Thermo-mechanical mismatch is also expected to play a positive role.

In the case of the silver glasses, there is no appreciable change in the modulus of the base glass due to the incorporation of the metal, because the intrinsic Moduli of silver and the base glass are very similar. The rupture Modulus for bulk, metal containing samples is higher than that of the base glass. This is due to thermomechanical stresses and also to flaw size limitation. The tensile strengths of fibres in this series are lower than that of the base glass. Optical microscopic evidence shows that whereas the crystalline phase is fairly regular in shape in the bulk silver glasses, in the silver glass fibres; the

crystalline phase shows up as sharp streaks parallel to the fibre axis, and probably acts as stress concentrators.

Transmission Electron Microscopy has been used to observe the microstructure of glasses and glass fibres and also to evaluate the shapes, sizes and volume fractions of the dispersed phase. Attempts have been made to correlate observed microstructure with measured mechanical properties.

X-ray diffraction and selected Area diffraction in TEM have been used to identify the crystalline phase. This is Bismuth in the case of glasses in the Bismuth series and silver and calcium magnesium silicate in the case of the silver series.

Fracture surfaces have been studied by a two stage replica process to compare the fracture in the metal containing and the base glasses. The fracture surface is much rougher in the case of the metal containing glasses; this is attributed to the fact that the crack front follows a more tortuous path in such glasses. Replicas also show the interaction of the crack front with the second phase.

## Chapter 1

### INTRODUCTION

There is an increasing demand for high-performance materials for use in a very wide range of applications ranging from military and aerospace to biomedical and interest has been focussed on materials for limited or prolonged use at high temperatures. Originally metals were in the limelight but it was soon discovered that conventionally precipitation hardened metal alloys are not thermally stable and can undergo coarsening at temperatures even well below the softening point of the alloy, thus leading to a decrease in mechanical strength. Dispersion strengthened metals are found to lack adequate ductility at low and intermediate temperatures and are consequently prone to catastrophic failure. Metal matrix composites reinforced with ceramic fibres are rather prone to thermal degradation due to differences in the matrix-reinforcement thermal expansion coefficients. Many glasses and ceramics on the contrary exhibit fairly high strength and stability at elevated temperatures combined with a low density and chemical inertness. These are however brittle materials, subject to high notch sensitivity and thermal shock and fail catastrophically. It is in order to increase the



fracture toughness and the strength of such materials, that discrete particles with suitable thermal expansion coefficients and elastic moduli have been incorporated into the glass/ceramic matrix to act as barriers to crack propagation.

### 1.1 Dispersion Strengthened Glasses: Production

Dispersion strengthened glasses can be produced in a variety of ways. The second phase can be precipitated 'in situ' by a suitable choice of alloying additions and heat treatment and also by controlling the furnace atmosphere during the glass manufacture. Certain glasses can be induced to undergo phase separation to produce amorphous matrix - amorphous second phase composites or can be partially crystallized to form amorphous-crystalline composites. The latter includes low crystalline volume fraction glass ceramics. Standard powder metallurgy methods such as hot pressing have given rise to various glass/ceramic dispersion strengthened systems containing a fairly wide range of particle sizes and volume fractions of the second phase. Metals like Au, Ag and Cu can also be incorporated into glass by adding very small amounts of the metal in the glass batch along with a small amount of photosensitive nucleating agent and then subjecting the glass to a nucleation treatment by irradiating with  $\alpha$ -rays,  $\gamma$ -rays or U.V. rays of a suitable wavelength followed by controlled heat treatment for their further growth.

## 1.2 Theories of Dispersion Strengthening

Glasses being brittle materials, once a crack is initiated in them, there is no resistance to its propagation and consequently the failure occurs with no warning whatsoever. The focus was originally on producing stronger and tougher glasses so that a higher fracture initiation stress exists at failure, but, nevertheless failure is still catastrophic. Since it is impossible to fabricate an absolutely flaw free brittle component, crack initiation is a 'built in' stage and the key to producing stronger and tougher ceramics and glasses lies therefore in prolonging or arresting the crack propagation stage.

Gupta<sup>(1)</sup> has shown by means of a qualitative model based on thermodynamic criteria that stronger and tougher glasses can only be produced by resorting to multiphase systems as opposed to single phase ones. The essence of stable crack propagation is that when crack arrestors are present in a brittle matrix, the energy demand curve for crack propagation is nonlinear in contrast to a linear demand curve for the ideal Griffith material. For a single phase homogenous brittle material, the energy demand is the same throughout the material and the crack initiation and propagation stages coincide. In multiphase materials there is however a distinct division in energy demand between various

phases so that the initiation and propagation stages are distinct. The second phase stabilises a growing crack because when the crack encounters the particle it has either to cut through or detour around the zone and the energy demand suddenly increases. Crack propagation will therefore be halted unless there is an increment in the operating stress. The toughness and strength of such multiphase materials is thus higher than that of the single phase brittle matrix.

Dispersion strengthening of a continuous glass matrix has been attributed by Hasselman and Fulrath<sup>(2)</sup> to the fact that hard crystalline dispersions within the matrix will limit the size of the Griffith flaws thereby raising the stress required to initiate or propagate a crack. They divided the effects of dispersions on the size of flaws distributed throughout the bulk or surface of the glass into two regions. In the first, the average distance between particles is greater than the flaw size, a condition which is obtainable with suitable volume fractions and particle sizes of the second phase.

In this region, the size of an average flaw will be reduced according to the equation

$$a = a_0 (1 - \phi) \quad (1)$$

where  $a$  and  $a_0$  are the flaw sizes in the composite and glass

matrix respectively and  $\phi$  = volume fraction of dispersed phase.

Substituting this equation into the Griffith relation<sup>(3)</sup> for the macroscopic strength  $S_0$  of a flat glass plate containing an elliptical flaw viz.

$$S_0 = \left( \frac{4\gamma E}{\pi a} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad (2)$$

$\gamma$  = surface energy or energy associated with the formation of unit area of the surface formed by fracture;  $E$  = Elastic Modulus of the system and  $a$  = twice the major axis of the ellipse, i.e. the flaw size.

Substituting for 'a' from (1) into (2) and rearranging gives

$$S = S_0 (1 - \phi)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \quad (3)$$

At higher volume fractions or smaller particle sizes, the flaws as given by (2) will be larger than the average distance between particles which means that the flaw size is now governed by the mean free path between the particles. This is region II. An expression for the mean free path ' $\lambda$ ' between spherical particles of uniform radius  $R$  distributed statistically through a matrix takes the form

$$\lambda = \frac{4R}{3} \frac{(1 - \phi)}{\phi} \quad (4)$$

and a substitution for 'a' in equation (1) gives

$$S = \left[ \frac{3\gamma E \phi}{\pi R(1-\phi)} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad (5)$$

A plot between strength and reciprocal square root of mean free path should therefore be practically horizontal at high values of mean free path and should show a change in slope at the point where mean free path equals the original flaw size. Thereafter as the mean free path decreases further, the plot should follow a straight line through the origin.

Lange<sup>(4)</sup> postulated a different model to account for dispersion strengthening of glass. His model is based on the fact that a crack front possesses a line energy and tends to bow out between the second phase dispersion while still remaining pinned at all positions where it encounters the dispersion. Thus, during the initial stage of crack propagation, both new fracture surface and the length of the crack front is increased due to its change in shape between pinning positions and the fractional increase in crack front per unit crack extension will depend on the particle spacing. Catastrophic failure occurs when the crack front just breaks away from its pinning positions and the fracture energy depends not only on the amount of energy required to form new surface area but also on the spacing between the dispersed second phase. This is represented in the equation

$$G_c = 2 \left( \gamma_0 + \frac{T}{\lambda} \right) \quad (6)$$

$G_c$  = amount of energy required to extend a crack by a unit length,  $\gamma_0$  = surface energy of the material/unit area,  $T$  = line energy per unit length of crack front and  $\lambda$  equals

distance between second phase dispersions.

the strength of a material  $S \propto \sqrt{G_c}$  (Irwin 1958) (7)

Thus the strength of a composite containing a second phase dispersion is inversely proportional to the square root of the distance between the second phase dispersion.

Dispersion strengthening may also be looked at in the light of elastic moduli, Thermal Expansion Coefficients and Thermo-Mechanical stresses.

Load sharing occurs in a dispersion of a higher modulus second phase in a lower modulus glassy matrix. If the components in the system share the applied load in proportion to their elastic moduli, the strain in all components in unidirectional tension will be the same or in other words the matrix and the second phase deform to the same extent. Then

$$\epsilon_p = \epsilon_g = \epsilon_T$$

and

$$\sigma_p/E_p = \sigma_g/E_g = \sigma_T/E_T, \text{ giving by rearrangement:}$$

$$\sigma_{f_T} = \left(\frac{E_T}{E_g}\right) \sigma_{f_g} \quad (8)$$

where subscripts p, g and T refer to the second phase, the glassy matrix and the composite system respectively. Subscript f refers to conditions at fracture. This mechanism depends on an effective stress transfer to the dispersed

phase; which requires that the bonding between the dispersed phase and the matrix should be very strong.

Borom<sup>(5)</sup> put forward the theory that thermomechanical mismatch between the second phase and the glass matrix gives rise to a state of variable compressive stress throughout the matrix, which would oppose crack propagation. The development of a variable compressive stress in the glassy matrix can be visualized by considering the stresses for the case of a single particle of a high expansion coefficient material cooled from a high-temperature zero-stress state in a lower expansion coefficient matrix. The particle is in a state of hydrostatic tension and the matrix experiences at the interface, hoop compressive stresses and radial tensile stresses which decrease as the distance from the interface increases. The boundary conditions for the stress distribution in the above concentric sphere case require that the radial - tensile stresses decrease to zero at a free surface but the hoop compressive stresses do not. In a low-expansion matrix containing a random dispersion of high-expansion spheres, the radial tensile component need not decrease to zero between particles but, due to interaction with the higher and more gently decaying hoop compressive stress from an orthogonally positioned pair of particles, the radial tensile component can be reduced or even reversed in sign. Such an interaction would thus create compressive stresses in the glass matrix.

The shape of the second phase particles would also affect the strength of the composite. Spherically shaped particles have the lowest stress concentrating effect, whereas adversely shaped particles with sharply pointed dimensions could act as very effective stress concentrators.

The net effect of the second phase particles is thus a combination of a variety of factors such as Elastic Moduli, Thermal Expansion Coefficients, shape size and volume fractions of the dispersed phase, original flaw size in the glass matrix, interfacial bonding and the existence of residual or localized stresses. The maximum strength attainable by particle reinforcement is generally only 2-3 times that of the unreinforced matrix.

### 1.3 Glasses Containing Bismuth and Silver

Silver has been grown<sup>(6)</sup> by subjecting a glass of composition 71.5  $\text{SiO}_2$ , 23.5  $\text{Na}_2\text{O}$ , 4  $\text{Al}_2\text{O}_3$ , 1  $\text{ZnO}$ , 0.02  $\text{CeO}_2$  (photosensitive nucleating agent) and 0.002 Ag (all weight percents) to irradiation with UV light and then to a controlled heat treatment to get silver particles of about 160  $\text{\AA}$  size which are spherical in shape.

Keshavaram<sup>(7)</sup> has studied some mechanical properties of glasses containing silver incorporated due to the addition of  $\text{Ag}_2\text{SO}_4$  in the original glass batch. Glasses in the



system  $\text{SiO}_2\text{-B}_2\text{O}_3\text{-Sb}_2\text{O}_3\text{-K}_2\text{O-Al}_2\text{O}_3\text{-As}_2\text{O}_3$  containing 4 and 6 mole  $\text{Ag}_2\text{O}$  were found to exhibit strengths of about two to three times that of the corresponding glass matrices.

Transmission electron micrographs of such glasses revealed dark droplets of almost spherical shape distributed statistically in the glassy matrix. Sizes of the particles were measured to lie between 450-1200 Å.

Chakravorty, Vithlan and Mehta<sup>(8)</sup> have studied the Self Diffusion coefficients of sodium for glasses in the system  $\text{Na}_2\text{O-B}_2\text{O}_3\text{-Bi}_2\text{O}_3\text{-SiO}_2$  and have also studied their D.C. resistivities in the same range of temperature. The glasses were found to have a microstructure consisting of a distribution of droplets of an electronically dense phase in the glassy matrix. From correlation factor studies, they concluded that the droplet phase does not consist solely of Bismuth, but also contains some Alkali ions.

Electrical and switching properties of various other glasses containing  $\text{Bi}_2\text{O}_3$  in the systems  $\text{Na}_2\text{O-Bi}_2\text{O}_3\text{-B}_2\text{O}_3$ <sup>(9)</sup>,  $\text{Na}_2\text{O-CaO-SiO}_2\text{-Bi}_2\text{O}_3$ <sup>(10)</sup> and  $\text{PbO-Bi}_2\text{O}_3\text{-B}_2\text{O}_3$ <sup>(11)</sup> have been studied, and in all cases similar microstructures have been observed.

Bismuth and silver can be incorporated fairly easily (even though silver is rather prone to coagulation) into a variety of glass matrices, giving rise to glass-crystal-

composite systems. Volume fractions and particle sizes of the dispersed phase can be varied by preparing glasses containing different amounts of  $\text{Ag}_2\text{O}$  or  $\text{Bi}_2\text{O}_3$  and/or by controlling the melt conditions.

#### 1.4 Glass Fibres

The theoretical strength of glass is  $10^6$  psi, but strengths achieved in practice are known to be less than a hundredth of this value. This is because the strength of glass depends almost entirely on the condition of the surface and particularly on the presence of stress-concentrating features of both a microscopic and a macroscopic nature. These could be holes, notches, steps or changes of section, inclusions etc. For glass, the apparent ratio of strength of fine glass fibres to that of bulk glass is about 50:1. Griffiths in 1920 suggested that the surface of bulk glass contained innumerable small flaws of average depth  $5\mu$ , which acted as stress concentrators. In fibres, such deep flaws are not possible and the possibility of encountering them would decrease as the diameter of the fibre decreases. The surface area of a fibre is also very much less than that of bulk glass and consequently the density of flaws is also correspondingly much less. Again, during the drawing process, pores and gas bubbles get elongated into capillaries along the central line of the fibre (leaving the surface free) and their stress concentrating effect is reduced.

In fibres subject to damage by abrasion, the 'size' effect is due entirely to the fact that flaw density increases with increasing surface area. This fact was established conclusively in 1960 by Thomas,<sup>(12)</sup> who showed that an unabraded or 'virgin' fibre did not show any appreciable change in strength over a wide range of diameters.

Fibres drawn from silver containing glasses were shown by Keshavaram to exhibit a slightly higher strength than the fibres of the corresponding base glasses.

The major application of glass fibres is in composites. The most extensively used fibres are that of 'E' glass and have a virgin Tensile Strength of  $5 \times 10^5$  psi and a Modulus of Elasticity of about 10.95 mpsi.

## Chapter 2

### OBJECTIVES OF STUDY

- (1) To incorporate Bismuth and Silver dispersoids into glass systems  $\text{SiO}_2\text{-Al}_2\text{O}_3\text{-B}_2\text{O}_3\text{-K}_2\text{O}$  and  $\text{SiO}_2\text{-Na}_2\text{O-CaO-MgO-As}_2\text{O}_3$  respectively.
- (2) To draw fibres from all the metal containing and base glass compositions.
- (3) Measurement of Rupture Modulus and Young's Modulus in bending for all the bulk glasses.
- (4) Study of Tensile strength and Young's Modulus of fibres drawn from all the compositions.
- (5) DTA studies to observe the effect of metal additives on the glass Transition Temperature of the base glass.
- (6) Transmission Electron Microscope studies to determine the microstructure of all the glasses and the glass fibres and to correlate measured mechanical properties with observed microstructure.
- (7) Optical Microscope studies on crystallized glasses and glass fibres to observe shapes, sizes and volume fractions of the crystalline phase.

- (8) X-ray Diffraction studies on crystallized bulk glasses and glass fibres to identify the crystalline phase.
- (9) Fracture surface replica studies to compare the fracture of the metal-containing glasses with that of the base glasses and to study the interaction of the crack front with the dispersed phase.

## Chapter 3

### EXPERIMENTAL

#### 3.1 Preparation of Glass

Nine glass compositions in all were studied and are listed in Table 3.1A. Reagent grade chemicals were used in their preparation.  $K_2O$ ,  $Na_2O$  and  $CaO$  were added as their carbonates,  $Ag_2O$  was added as  $Ag_2SO_4$  and  $B_2O_3$  was taken in the form of  $H_3BO_3$ . Requisite quantities of batch powders were weighed out in an analytical balance transferred to a mortar and mixed thoroughly with the aid of Acetone.

In each case the batch was melted in alumina crucibles. An electrically heated 'globalar' furnace with a maximum attainable temperature of  $1450^{\circ}C$  was employed for the melting of the Bismuth containing glasses and an Alumina lined gas fired furnace capable of withstanding temperatures up to about  $1700^{\circ}C$  was used to melt the silver containing glasses as well as the corresponding base glass compositions. An oxygen-Indane gas mixture was used as fuel in the gas fired furnace whereas the globalar furnace melting was carried out under ordinary atmospheric conditions. In both cases, the heating rate was kept fairly slow upto  $1800^{\circ}C$ , partly to avoid cracking of the crucibles due to thermal shock and partly because gases

like  $\text{CO}_2$ ,  $\text{SO}_2$  and  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$  are given out in this range of temperature. Glass melts were stirred from time to time with an alumina rod, partly to remove bubbles and partly to judge when the casting consistency was reached. Achievement of bubble free glass was found rather difficult in the case of the Bismuth glasses, as they tend to corrode the crucible if kept at high temperatures for fairly long periods of time. It was also found to be very difficult to prevent the coagulation of silver during the melting of the silver containing glasses. In all cases, the glasses were cast onto Aluminium molds to slabs of dimension 20 cm x 4 cm x 1 cm and then annealed slowly from a suitable annealing temperature (Table 3.1b) up to room temperature.

### 3.2 Conversion of Bulk Glass to Glass Fibre

Fibres were drawn from all the nine glass compositions in a resistance heated globar furnace with a maximum attainable temperature of  $1550^\circ\text{C}$ . The rates of heating and cooling were kept to within  $150^\circ\text{C}/\text{hour}$ . The shape and dimensions of the single hole high Alumina Bushing employed for fibre drawing are shown in Fig. 3.2. The diameter of a fibre of a given composition depends on various factors such as Bushing temperature, Bushing-tip temperature, Head of glass in the bushing, fibre winding speed, diameter of the nozzle of the bushing, Bushing design etc. The shape and size of

the bushing used was the same in all cases and so also the nozzle diameter. The bushing was filled with glass up to  $3/4$  of its total height in the case of the Bismuth glass series whereas only a quarter filled bushing was used for the silver glasses. Fibre drawing temperatures and winding speeds were so manipulated as to get fairly fine fibres in all cases. Furnace temperatures during drawing ranged from  $960^{\circ}\text{C}$  to  $1340^{\circ}\text{C}$ . Fibre diameters are in the range  $5\text{ }\mu\text{m}$ - $11\text{ }\mu\text{m}$  except in the case of Glass 6 for which the range is  $8$ - $15\text{ }\mu\text{m}$ . Winding speeds varied from  $2666.3$  -  $2912.4$  ft/min. Fibre drawing parameters are listed in Table 3.1B.

### 3.3 Ultimate Tensile Strength and Young's Modulus of Fibres

In the case of the Bismuth glasses, the untouched filaments or 'virgin' fibres between the bushing and the winding drum were mounted for testing during the drawing process itself. A few 'off the drum' fibres were also tested to see whether there was any appreciable change in strength between the two. In the case of the silver glasses, only 'off the drum' fibres were tested.

Fairly stiff, smooth rectangular bits of paper of width  $1.5\text{ cm}$ , thickness  $0.5\text{ mm}$  and lengths of about  $6.0\text{ cm}$  more than the test gage length of fibres were used as fibre mounts. An oval slot of about  $1.2\text{ cm}$  semi minor axis



and a length exactly equal to the test gage length of fibres and parallel to the length of the mount was cut in the centre of each mount. The fibres were then mounted in a line through the centre of each slot and parallel to the length of the slot. Quick fix was used at the mouths of the oval slot to hold the fibre firmly to the mount. The extra lengths of fibre extending for about 3 cm beyond the slot on either side were fixed to the ends of the mounts by using cellotape. These extra ends were used for diameter measurements in cases where the bits of fibre remaining within the gage length after breaking were too small to be of any use. The mounts were stored by suspending them vertically from a round circular stand which just fitted into a dessicator. Since fibres could usually be tested only a day or so after mounting, this ensured that in the meantime the fibres were protected from attack by moisture and dust particles and also from further abrasion.

The Instron was used to break the fibres in tension. The load cell used had a range 0-50 gms with a least count of 0.1 gm. A uniform chart speed of 2 cm/min was used throughout. Two cross head speeds were tried out, one of 0.02 cm/min and the other of 0.05 cm/min. Gage lengths tested were 2.0 cm and 5.0 cm respectively.

The Instron was first calibrated and then the fibre mount was suspended freely from the upper grip of the machine and adjustment was made for the weight of the mount. The

fibre mount was then firmly gripped between the two grips of the Instron and the load was then adjusted to a suitable reference zero. The sides of the mount were then cut carefully, leaving the fibre intact so that when the cross head was made to move, the fibre took up the entire load. Fibres were pulled to breaking and the breaking loads were read off directly from the Instron chart. Strains were obtained by use of the following equation:

$$\text{Strain} = \frac{\text{Cross Head Speed} \times \text{Time Taken for breaking}}{\text{Original gage length of the fibre}} =$$

$$\frac{\text{Cross Head Speed} \times \text{Total distance Covered by Chart Upto Point of Breaking}}{\text{Chart speed} \times \text{Original gage length of fibre}} \quad (9)$$

The diameter of the fibres were measured after breaking. Two different instruments were tried out for this purpose -- A reflected light optical microscope and a horizontal 'Sheffield' Accutition. Fibre diameters were measured at a magnification of 750X in the optical microscope using a calibrated eyepiece capable of reading up to 0.1967  $\mu\text{m}$ . Since fibre diameters were measured in air and not in a medium of suitably contrasting refractive index, diffraction bands were obtained on either side of the fibre. These bands had to be included in the diameter of the fibre as it was impossible to distinguish where the fibre ended and the diffraction band began.

A Sheffield horizontal Accutron was also used to measure fibre diameters. The Accutron was first calibrated by using standard slip gages and then the pointer on the scale was adjusted to zero with the tips of the horizontal measuring device just touching each other. The fibre was then introduced between the two tips and their resulting separation was read off directly on the graduated scale to accuracy of 0.00001" or 0.2540  $\mu\text{m}$ . For fibres fatter than about 10.2  $\mu\text{m}$ , the scale was switched to the next higher one which could read diameters up to 20.3  $\mu\text{m}$  with a least count of 0.508  $\mu\text{m}$ .

Between 12-20 fibres were tested of each composition and the ultimate Tensile strength (UTS) was calculated in each case. The Young's modulus was obtained by dividing the ultimate Tensile Strength of each fibre by the strain as obtained from equation (9). Results are presented in the Tabular form and also in the form of Histograms.

### 3.4 Rupture Modulus and Young's Modulus in Bending of Bulk Glass

The rectangular slabs of glass of dimensions 20 cm x 4 cm x 1 cm were sliced (parallel to the width of 4.0 cm) into slices of width about 1.0 cm using a diamond tipped wheel. These rectangular slices were then ground down to dimensions of about 4.0 cm x 0.5 cm x 0.5 cm using in

succession SiC of mesh sizes 100 and 240. After the dimensions were thus reduced, rough polishing was carried out with SiC of mesh sizes 400, 600 and 800 in that order. Ultimately  $\text{Al}_2\text{O}_3$  powder of  $0.3 \mu\text{m}$  size was used to impart an optical finish to the glass surfaces.

CT-3 strain gages (Rohits Co. India) of resistance 122 ohms and gage factor 1.96 were then affixed (one to each glass slab) to a surface of the polished slab using SR-4 strain gage cement. After fixing, a 1.5 Kg weight was kept firmly pressed onto the strain gages for at least 24 hours to ensure a strong bonding. Long strain gage wires were then soldered to the strain gages. The samples were then broken by 3-point bending in a jig of the type shown in Fig. 3.4. The modulus of rupture of the rectangular beams for centre loading was then calculated using the expression

$$\sigma_f = \frac{3}{2} \frac{P_f L}{bd^2} \quad (10)$$

where  $P_f$  = breaking load or force,  $L$  = span or distance between the two outer (knife) edges of the jig,  $b$  = width and  $d$  = thickness of the bar. The stress at any load  $P$  can also be obtained from the above expression.

For determining the Young's Modulus in bending, the strain gage attached to the sample was connected in a quarter bridge circuit and strains were read off at load intervals of 2.5 Kg (or less) in the load range from zero load to breaking load in a Budd P350-A Model Strain Indicator.

Stresses were calculated at every 2.5 Kg (or less) load interval and were then plotted against the corresponding strains as read off on the strain indicator. The slope of the plot gives the Young's Modulus in Bending in each case. An average of about four specimens of each composition were tested and the mean values of the Ultimate Tensile Stress (UTS) and the Young's Modulus in Bending  $E_b$  were calculated for each composition.

### 3.5 Microstructure of Glasses and Glass Fibres by Transmission Electron Microscopy

To prepare samples for TEM studies from Bulk glass, the surface of a slice of glass was cleaned thoroughly with Acetone and then scratched with a fine tipped diamond scratcher. Very small wedge shaped particles were thus obtained and a few of these were transferred onto a 200 mesh copper grid coated with a carbon layer about  $100-200 \text{ \AA}^0$  thick. The thin edge of the wedge shaped particles is about  $100 \text{ \AA}^0$  thick and was found to be transparent to the electron beam. The sample containing grid was then coated with another layer of carbon of about the same thickness. The carbon films provided a mechanical support to the glass particles and prevented them from falling off the grid into the EM column. They also served to conduct heat away from the glass particles which are very poor conductors of heat.

The grid containing glass particles sandwiched between two layers of carbon was then studied by TEM.

For fibre studies, a bunch of glass fibres was powdered in an agate mortar to 325 mesh size and a pinch of fibre powder was added to about 10 cc of distilled water in a clean test tube. The test tube was subjected to ultrasonic shaking for about 2 minutes to disperse the powder. It was then left undisturbed for 5-10 minutes to allow the heavier particles if any to settle down. A drop of the milky top solution was pipetted onto a carbon coated grid and was allowed to dry. Another carbon layer was then coated onto the powder just as in the bulk glass sample. This method of preparing fibre samples gave a uniform dispersion of fine particles throughout the grid.

Microstructural details were photographed in the TEM and SAD patterns were also recorded to study the crystalline phase.

Photographs of microstructure were used to measure particle sizes and volume fractions of the dispersed second phase.

### 3.6 Preparation of Fracture Surface Replicas for TEM Studies

A two-stage replica technique was adopted for studying the fracture surfaces of the metal containing and the base

glasses. The fractured surface of the specimen was cleaned thoroughly using El Acetone. A square of cellulose Acetate based replicating tape cut to dimensions slightly bigger than those of the fracture surface was dipped carefully into El grade Acetone such that only <sup>one</sup> surface touched the Acetone. The sticky side of the replicating tape was then pressed down carefully and firmly onto the fracture surface. After about fifteen minutes the edges of the tape sticking out beyond the fracture surface were trimmed and the entire section of tape was lifted carefully off the fracture surface with the aid of a strip of cello tape. The strip of cello tape with the fracture replica facing upwards was fastened firmly onto a thoroughly cleansed glass slide. A layer of Gold about  $50 \text{ \AA}$  thick (just sufficient to impart a faint bluish tinge) was then evaporated onto the glass slide at an angle of about  $5-10^\circ$ . Immediately afterwards the slide was coated with a  $150-200 \text{ \AA}$  thick carbon layer. The coated square of replicating tape was then cut out and lifted away from the cello tape. The square was then quartered and each of the quarters were transferred to a dish containing El grade Acetone. After about half an hour the plastic dissolved and the carbon coated gold film floated on the surface. These films were then fished out and transferred to fresh El grade Acetone in another dish. After another half hour when no plastic was left adhering to the film,

it was lifted out on a 200 mesh copper grid, dried for a few minutes and then studied under the TEM. A 60 kV beam potential was used for all samples as it was found to give a good contrast.

### 3.7 X-Ray Diffraction Studies of Crystallised Glasses and Crystallised Glass Fibres

Some of the glasses and glass fibres were suspected to be crystallized and then X-ray diffraction patterns were studied in order to identify the crystalline phase present. Each of the crystallized glasses and glass fibres were powdered separately in an agate mortar to a fine powder of particle size smaller than 325 mesh. This powder was mounted on a perspex mount in the case of glasses 7 and 6 respectively and on a clean glass slide in the case of glass 5 and glass fibres 5 and 7. The samples were scanned in the diffractometer from  $20^{\circ}$  to about  $80^{\circ}$ , using  $\text{CuK}_{\alpha}$  radiation of wavelength  $1.54062 \text{ \AA}$ . Two different c.p.s. were used, one of 100 and one of 500. Angles at which well defined peaks occurred were noted down in each case and the corresponding 'd' values were calculated from the Bragg equation

$$2d \sin \theta = n\lambda$$

$n$  = an integer, here taken as unity

$\lambda$  = Wavelength of X-ray radiation

$\theta$  = Bragg Angle

$d$  = interplanar spacing.



The 'a' values and the relative intensities of observed peaks were then compared with standard data from the A.S.T.M. tables in order to identify the crystalline phase.

### 3.8 Microstructural Studies by Optical Microscopy

Crystallised glasses and glass fibres were studied under a reflected light optical microscope. The glass fibres were focussed at a magnification of 750x when the crystalline phase showed up as bright streaks along the length of the fibre. Photographs were taken at a camera magnification of 1/3rd the microscope magnification with exposure times of 2, 3 and 5 secs respectively. Optimum contrast was obtained with the 5 sec exposure.

For crystallised bulk glass studies, the glass surfaces were polished down to 0.3  $\mu$ m surface finish and then etched for a suitable length of time in a 5% HF solution for a suitable contrast. Photographs were taken with exposure times of 2, 3 and 5 secs respectively at a microscope magnification of 300x. Camera magnification was 100x.

Wherever possible, the volume percent of the crystalline phase was computed from the photographs by using the point counting technique. A transparent graph sheet was pinned to the photograph and the no. of intersection points of the graph paper which coincided with the crystalline phase were noted.

The total number of intersection points in that area of the graph paper were also noted. The percent volume of crystallization was then obtained from the expression,

$$\text{Percent volume crystallization} = \frac{n}{N} \times 100$$

where n = number of intersection points in the selected area of graph paper which coincide with the crystalline phase.

N = Total no. of intersection points in the selected area of graph paper.

### 3.9 Differential Thermal Analysis (DTA), Thermogravimetry (TG) and Derivative Thermogravimetry (DTG)

DTA measures the changes in heat content as a function of difference in temperature existing between the sample under investigation and a thermally inert material taken as a reference compound, the two being heated at a fixed rate, simultaneously. TG measures the changes in weight of the sample under investigation as it is heated at a predetermined rate. The DTG technique consists of measuring the rate of weight loss of the sample as it is heated at a specified rate. The DTA, TG and DTG curves for all the nine glasses have been recorded in a 'Mom Derivatograph'.

Samples were prepared for DTA, TG and DTG by crushing the glasses to particles of a size between -14 to +20 mesh, a size range which has been reported in literature as being

large enough to avoid surface crystallization. The glass particles were then mixed with fine  $\text{Al}_2\text{O}_3$  powder in the ratio of 7:3 by volume to preventing their getting sintered during the run. The glass samples were run at a heating rate of  $10^\circ\text{C}/\text{min}$  in the temperature range from room temperature to  $1000^\circ\text{C}$ . In most cases, a high sensitivity of 1/5 had to be used in DTA to clearly distinguish the Glass Transition temperature represented by the first dip in the curve.

## Chapter 4

### RESULTS

#### 4.1 Differential Thermal Analysis of Glasses 1 to 9

The glass transition temperatures for glasses 1 to 9 as indicated by the first dip in the DTA curve are shown in Figs. 4.1A and 4.1B and are tabulated in the table 4.1.

The introduction of  $\text{Bi}_2\text{O}_3$  or  $\text{Ag}_2\text{O}$  into the glass batch is generally seen to lower the glass transition temperature. The lowering is more in the silver containing glasses than in the Bismuth containing ones.

#### 4.2 Ultimate Tensile Strengths and Young's Moduli of Glass Fibres

The Tensile strengths and Young's Moduli of 12-27 fibres of 2.0 cm gage length in each of the nine glass compositions are recorded in the Tables 4.201 to 4.209. They are also plotted in the form of Histograms in Fig. 4.21 to 4.29. The diameters of the fibres have been measured using the Accutron.

Table 4.210 shows the Ultimate Tensile Strength and Young's Modulus values for fibres of Glass 9 using values of diameter measured by the Optical Microscope. Optical Microscopic data gave a Young's Modulus of 6.3 mpsi as

against the value of 10.02 mpsi obtained for the same fibres using Accutron measured diameters.

It was observed that the strengths of fairly fine and relatively fat Bismuth containing glass fibres of the same composition differed very little from one another. Again 'off' the drum metal containing glass fibres showed the same strengths as the untouched fibres of the same glass composition with the same diameter. In order to verify whether this effect was due to the presence of the metal or not, 5.0 cm gage lengths of fibres of glasses 7 and 9 were tested under identical conditions and the Tensile Strengths and Young's Moduli so obtained are tabulated in Tables 4.211 and 4.212 respectively.

The decrease in the average strength of the 5.0 cm gage lengths fibres of Glass 9 as compared to that of the 2.0 cm gage length fibres of the same composition, tested in the same way, is 36.56%.

The corresponding decrease in the strength of fibres of Glass 7 is seen to be only 19.1%.

#### 4.3 Rupture Modulus and Young's Modulus in Bending of Bulk Glasses

The Rupture Moduli and Young's Moduli in Bending of bulk glasses, 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9 are tabulated in Tables 4.31 and 4.32. Glass 3 had a very high level of

porosity and therefore values obtained for this glass are not tabulated.

Rupture Moduli and Young's Moduli of the Bismuth containing glasses are higher than those of the corresponding base glass. In the silver series, the Rupture Moduli of the metal containing glasses are higher than that of the base glass, but the Young's Moduli do not show any appreciable change.

The values of  $E_b$  quoted in the Tables 4.31 and 4.32 are calibrated ones. Calibration has been done with respect to A and C glasses of known  $E_b$  values which were broken under exactly identical conditions. Care was taken to keep the same level of strain in the A and C glasses as in the experimental glass compositions.

Fig. 4.31 has been included to show how  $E_b$  has been obtained from the stress values as calculated from the Instron chart and sample dimensions and the strain values as obtained from the strain indicator. It also gives some idea of the level of strain in the sample for a given applied load.

#### 4.4 X-Ray Diffraction Analysis of Glasses and Glass Fibres

Bulk Glasses 7 and 6 were found to give 4-5 peaks in the X-ray Diffraction pattern. The angles corresponding to the peaks and the relative heights of the peaks were

used to calculate  $d_{hkl}$  and  $I/I_1$  values for these glasses. The values are tabulated in the Table 4.41. A.S.T.M. tables for silver and calcium magnesium silicate are shown in the Table 4.67. The  $d_{hkl}$  and  $I/I_1$  values for these bulk glasses are seen to compare very favourably with those for silver. Some of the  $d_{hkl}$  values are also seen to be similar to those for calcium Magnesium Silicate; although here the correspondence is not as good as in the case of Silver.

The X-ray diffraction of fibres of glasses 5, 6 and 7 were studied but only those of glass 7 gave peaks.  $I/I_1$  and  $d_{hkl}$  values for these peaks are also shown in the Table 4.41. Values of  $d_{hkl}$  are in fairly close agreement with those for silver.

X-ray diffraction patterns for glasses 6 and 7 and glass fibres 7 are shown in figures 4.41, 4.42 and 4.43 respectively.

#### 4.5 Microstructure by Optical Microscopy

Glasses 5, 6 and 7 and glass fibres of glasses 5, 6 and 7 were studied under the optical microscope using reflected light. The crystalline phase in glasses 6 and 7 showed up as small, fairly regular shaped particles, at a microscope magnification of 300x. Photographs were taken after subjecting the glass surfaces to a suitable etch

treatment, but still showed a very poor contrast. The crystalline phase in the glass 5 showed up only very vaguely in the microscope and was not photographed.

The percent volume fraction of the crystallized phase in glass 6 was computed from the photograph 4.51 and is about 47.8. The average particle size is about 22  $\mu\text{m}$ . The contrast in photograph 4.52 for glass 7 is too poor to make any reliable measurements but the volume fractions and particle sizes of the dispersed phase when seen directly under the microscope appear to be very close to those for glass 6.

The crystalline phase in fibres of glasses 5, 6 and 7 shows up as bright streaks parallel to the fibre axis (photographs 4.53 to 4.55). It is not possible to estimate the volume fraction of the crystalline phase from these photographs, because at a particular focus of the microscope only a few streaks are visible in a given length of fibre. On slightly altering the focus without moving the fibre, the streaks already present fade away and others come into view.

#### 4.6 Microstructure of Glasses and Glass Fibres by TEM Studies

The microstructure in the Bismuth containing glasses and glass fibres, consists of spherically shaped, electronically dense droplets distributed in the glassy matrix.



The volume fractions as calculated from the micrographs 4.601 to 4.607 are tabulated in the table 4.61 and range from about 26 percent to 42 percent. The average size of the dispersed spheres ranges from  $97\text{\AA}$  to  $313\text{\AA}$ . In the silver containing glasses and glass fibres, spherically shaped particles were not observed in all cases. Generally, in this series of glasses, patchy regions were observed. Typical microstructures in silver glasses and glass fibres are shown in photographs 4.603 to 4.613.

S.A.D. photographs 4.615 to 4.619 were taken to identify the crystalline phases present in the glasses and glass fibres. The phase is Bismuth in the case of the Bismuth glasses and glass fibres and Silver and Calcium Magnesium Silicate in the case of silver glasses and glass fibres (Tables 4.62 to 4.67).

S.A.D. photographs were usually obtainable directly from certain patchy regions. The spherical regions generally gave only very feeble spots on the screen, but on subjecting these regions to electron beam bombardment in the EM, for a fairly long period of time, coagulation occurred to give patchy regions which showed intense diffraction spots.

#### 4.7 Fracture Surface Replicas

Fracture surface replicas of the metal containing and base glass compositions are shown in photographs 4.701 to 4.710.

Photographs 4.701 to 4.704 show the increased fracture surface roughness of metal containing glasses as compared to those of the base glasses as seen in photographs 4.705 to 4.708.

Replicas of some of the crystalline glasses in the silver series show fracture steps formed by the interaction of the crack front with the dispersed phase. This is seen in photographs 4.709 and 4.710. Such steps were not observed in the base glass replicas.

DISCUSSION5.1 DTA Curves:

In general, the DTA curves reveal that the glass transition temperature of the base glass is lowered when  $\text{Ag}_2\text{O}$  or  $\text{Bi}_2\text{O}_3$  is added to it. This is probably because these oxides act as network modifiers and render the glass network less rigid; thereby altering the viscosity of the glass. This change is reflected in the lowering of  $T_g$  and also in the fact that the metal containing glasses are found to be more fluid at any given temperature above the liquidus temperature, than the corresponding base glass.

The lowering of  $T_g$  is seen to be more for the silver containing glasses than for the Bismuth based glasses.

5.2 Ultimate Tensile Strength and Young's Modulus of Fibres

The Tensile Strengths and Young's Moduli of Bismuth containing glass fibres are seen to be higher than those of the corresponding base glass. The base glass in this series is a low modulus glass, having a modulus of only 5.3 mpsi. The modulus of ~~Bismuth~~ <sup>the dispersed phase</sup> is probably higher than this value, which would account for the increase in Young's Modulus of the base glass when  $\text{Bi}_2\text{O}_3$  is added to it.

The Tensile Strength of the fibres of glasses 1,2,3,4 and 5 are respectively about  $(1.0, 1.5, 1.2, 1.9 \text{ and } 0.8) \times 10^5$  psi. Their Young's Moduli are respectively 6.4, 8.0, 6.0, 9.7 and 5.3 mpsi. When these values of  $\sigma$  and  $\tau$  are substituted into the equation (8); values of  $\sigma_{fT}$  obtained in each case are slightly less than the actual strengths observed. This implies that there is a slight strengthening over and above that expected merely due to modulus enhancement in each case. The increase is probably attributable to flaw size limitation and/or to strengthening due to induced thermo-mechanical compressive stresses created during casting.

In the silver series, the Young's Modulus of the base glass fibres is obtained as  $\sim 10$  mpsi; whereas that of silver (hand drawn) is reported to be 11.24 mpsi. No appreciable modulus enhancement is therefore expected, and observations tally with this fact. The tensile strengths of fibres in this series are lower than those of the corresponding base glass. Optical microscopic evidence shows the crystalline phase in such fibres to be in the form of sharp streaks along the fibre axis and strength decrease could be because of stress concentrating effects associated with such streaks.

In all cases, Accutron measured fibre diameters give values of strengths and Moduli which are reasonably close to

literature values for the kind of compositions studied, keeping in mind the fact that none of the fibres were coated with a sizing agent. Optical microscopic measurements of fibre diameters (in air) give rise to a large error in the UTS and E values. This is because of the fact that diffraction bands are included in the measured diameters. In all cases, values of UTS and E as obtained by using the optical microscope are about 1.4 - 2.0 times lower than those obtained from Accutron diameters; for the range of fibre diameters used here.

The percentage decrease in the strength of fibres of glass 9 when a 5.0 cm gage length is used instead of 2.0 cm gage length is about 36.6 percent as against 19 percent for fibres of glass 7. This implies that the effect of flaw density in metal containing glass fibres is not as significant as it is for the non-metal containing base glass fibres.

### 5.3 Rupture Modulus and Young's Modulus in Bending for Bulk Glass:

The Rupture Moduli and Young's Moduli in bending for the Bismuth containing glasses are higher than the corresponding values for the base glass. Here again, strength increase is attributable to modulus enhancement and to flaw size limitation and/or thermomechanical stresses.

Young's Moduli in bending of glasses in the silver series do not show any appreciable increase over that for the base glass, as is expected. In this case the increase in Rupture Modulus over that of the base glass is not due to modulus enhancement, but can be attributed to flaw size limitation. Fracture surface replicas for glasses 6 and 7 bear out this fact.

The Young's Moduli in 3-pt. bending have been obtained from stress-strain values and not from the expression (11)

$$E_b = \frac{PL^3}{4bd^3y} \quad (11)$$

(P, L, b, and d have the same meaning as in equation (10) and y is the deflection of the sample corresponding to a given load P).

used by Hing and McMillan<sup>(13)</sup> in a similar experiment.  $E_b$  values when calculated using the above expression were found to be an order of magnitude lower than the expected values. This is probably due to the fact that the jig also takes up some strain and the deflection y when calculated from factors like Cross-Head speed, chart speed and distance moved by chart from zero load to the breaking load, is not the actual deflection of the sample. Values of y are thus overestimated giving very low  $E_b$  values.

Strain gages were therefore used on the samples to measure the maximum strain in the sample (i.e. strain gages are positioned on the glass surface at a point just below the middle bar of the 3-pt. bending apparatus), and  $E_b$  was calculated from the stress-strain curve. This method proved much better but because the strain gage cement used was a little old, slightly high  $E_b$  values were obtained and the results had to be calibrated with respect to samples of 'A' and 'C' glasses with the same level of strain.

#### 5.4 X-Ray Diffraction Analysis:

Values of  $d_{hkl}$  and  $I/I_1$  for bulk glasses 6 and 7 are in very close agreement with those for silver. In the case of fibres of glass 7,  $d_{hkl}$  values match well, but the  $I/I_1$  values do not.

Some of the  $d_{hkl}$  values for calcium magnesium silicate and Akermanite also come fairly close to those obtained from the glass samples. The ASTM data for calcium magnesium silicate (and Akermanite) have been obtained using  $Co K_{\alpha}$  radiation whereas  $Cu K_{\alpha}$  radiation was used for the glass samples. It is, therefore, possible that calcium magnesium silicate is also present in these glasses. The supposition is further borne out by the fact that this phase is known to commonly occur in  $CaO-MgO-SiO_2$  based glasses and that silver is known to act as a nucleating agent for the growth of various

The fact that only Glass 7 fibres gave diffraction peaks is probably because only 50-60 percent of fibres of glasses 5 and 6 were seen to contain crystalline streaks, whereas in glass 7 every fibre showed the streaks. In spite of the fact that it has the maximum number of streaks, fibres of glass 7 still show the highest strength values among the three silver containing glass fibres and this is explainable on the basis of the fact that the streaks in glass 7 fibres are longer and more continuous throughout the length of the fibre.

#### 5.5 Optical Microscopy:

Optical microscopic evidence show bulk glasses 6 and 7 and fibres of glasses 5, 6 and 7 to be crystallized. The average particle size in glasses 6 and 7 is about 20  $\mu\text{m}$  and the percent volume of crystallization is roughly 48. Particles are not quite spherical and are also quite large in size, which accounts for the relatively low Rupture Moduli observed here as compared to values reported for various glass ceramics. Rupture Moduli are however a little higher than that of the base glass.

The relatively high volume fractions obtained here can be explained on the basis of the fact that the crystalline phase is not silver alone but also includes calcium magnesium silicate.



In the glass fibres, the crystalline phase is observed as longish streaks because it is getting extruded along the fibre axis during the drawing process.

#### 5.6 TEM Studies for Characterization of the Microstructure of Glasses and Glass Fibres:

The micro-structure in Bismuth containing glasses and glass fibres, as revealed by TEM consists of a distribution of dark spheres in the glassy matrix. These spheres act as barriers to crack propagation and marginally increase the length of the crack front, thereby raising the stress required to propagate the crack. The slight increase in strength over and above that due to modulus enhancement alone could be explained by this model.

The relatively high volume fractions observed in some cases are explainable on the basis of the work of Chakravorty, Vithlani and Mehta who established that the dark spherical regions in Bismuth glasses contain some Alkali ions in addition to Bismuth. The spherical phase in such cases is thus rich in Bismuth but does not consist solely of Bismuth.

S.A.D. photographs of Bismuth containing glasses and fibres were analysed. Some of the  $d_{hkl}$  values obtained are in fairly close agreement with the corresponding  $d_{hkl}$  values for Bismuth. Analysis of one such typical SAD pattern is included in the tables.

The mean free paths for crack propagation in Bismuth glasses and glass fibres were calculated from the particle sizes and volume fractions of the dispersed spherical phase. For both bulk glasses and glass fibres, the strength is seen to increase when the mean free path decreases, (Table 5.61). A plot of  $\sqrt{l/\lambda}$  versus UTS for Bismuth containing fibres is shown in the Fig. 5.61. Two straight lines can be drawn as shown; in accordance with Hasselman and Fulrath's theory. The plot is not very reliable as strength values for fibres have a fairly wide scatter and their average value has been used in the plot. Again, only four data points are there and many more are actually required to draw a reliable plot of this kind. An idea of the order of surface energy can be obtained however. Using the expression,  $\gamma = \pi(\text{slope})^2/E$  and a value of  $E = 5.3$  mpsi, the surface energy for uncoated Bismuth containing fibres is obtained to be  $2676.5 \text{ Ergs/cm}^2$ .

The trend of increasing strength values with decreasing mean free path was also observed in the Bismuth containing bulk glasses. In this series, strengths are in the order: Glass 1 > Glass 2 > Glass 4 > Glass 8 and mean free paths are in the inverse order. The amounts of  $\text{Bi}_2\text{O}_3$  added to glass batches 1, 2 and 4 during the glass melting are respectively 3, 5 and 10 mole percent. The actual percent volume fractions of spheres in these glasses are however,

about 42, 34 and 25 respectively. The amount of Bismuth in the glass is therefore, dependant not on the starting composition of the glass alone, but also on other factors such as the casting temperature, and time for which the glass melt was kept at different temperatures.

The Young's Moduli of Bismuth fibres follow the sequence:  $E_{\text{Glass 4}} > E_{\text{Glass 2}} > E_{\text{Glass 1}}$ . The volume fractions as calculated from TEM photographs are in the sequence  $\phi_{\text{Glass 2}} > \phi_{\text{Glass 4}} > \phi_{\text{Glass 1}} > \phi_{\text{Glass 3}}$ . The modulus of glass 4 fibres is higher than that for fibres of glass 2, even though the volume fraction of spheres in glass 4 fibres is a little lower than that for glass 2 fibres. This could be attributed to the fact that there is a large amount of inter connected dispersed phase in Glass 4 fibres.

For bulk Bismuth glasses, Moduli are in the sequence  $E_{\text{glass 4}} > E_{\text{glass 1}} > E_{\text{glass 2}}$ , and volume fractions are in the order  $\phi_{\text{glass 1}} > \phi_{\text{glass 2}} > \phi_{\text{glass 4}}$ . Glass 4 is seen to have both large isolated spheres and very fine interconnected particles. Volume fractions have been calculated for the large spheres but the modulus value would seem to be better explained had the interconnected phase been considered.

In the silver glass series, the above kind of analysis is not possible as in some cases, volume fractions are not estimatable from the photographs. Particle shapes are also seen to be spherical in some TEM photographs but irregular in others and the expression for mean free path used here is valid for a uniform distribution of spherical particles. Fibres in this series generally showed patchy microstructure in TEM and no idea of the volume fraction could be obtained from these.

#### 5.7 Fracture Surface Replicas:

In the ideal Griffith system, the condition for fracture is reached when the increase in surface energy resulting from a small extension of the crack is balanced by the release of elastic energy in the body surrounding the crack; and the elastic system under stress passes from the unbroken to the broken state by a process involving a continuous decrease in the potential free energy.

For any single fracture crack, following the attainment of the criterion of fracture, the release of elastic energy must then be in excess of that represented by the surface energy of the advancing crack. This energy must be absorbed in some manner, for example, by some augmentation of the surface area of the crack. This characteristic is found in different degrees in various types of fracture. Surfaces:

augmentation in some cases takes the form of an increased surface roughness. This roughness is very pronounced in the metal containing glasses as compared to that in the base glasses as is seen in the photographs 4.701 to 4.708.

Another characteristic feature of the interaction of a crack front with dispersed obstacles are the fracture 'steps' at the rear of the obstacles. These are seen in photographs 4.709 and 4.710. These steps have been explained by Lange as arising from the fact that the crack front is pinned down by the obstacles and at the same time it tries to break away by bowing out from between the pinning positions. When the crack front just breaks away, its arms meet at the rear of the obstacle, leaving these steps.

No such steps are observed in replicas of the non metal containing or base glasses.

Glass No.	Glass composition in mole percent									
	SiO <sub>2</sub>	B <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub>	Al <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub>	K <sub>2</sub> O	Bi <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub>	Na <sub>2</sub> O	CaO	MgO	Ag <sub>2</sub> O	As <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub>
1	55	30	6	6	3					
2	55	29	6	5	5					
3	55	27	6	5	7					
4	55	24	6	5	10					
5	72					13	9	4	1	1
6	72					13	8.5	4	1.5	1
7	72					13	8	4	2	1
8	55	33	6	6						
9	72					13	10	4		1

TABLE 3.1A

Glass	Casting Temperature (°C)	Annealing Temperature (°C)	Temperature at top of Bushing (°C)	Temperature at Bushing Tip (°C)	Fibre Winding Speed (ft/min)	Diameter Range of Fibres (µm)
1	1380	450	1120	910	2871.4	7.020-10.429
2	1420	450	1050	810	2871.4	5.334- 9.847
3	1300	400	960	763	2871.4	6.622-11.184
4	1280	400	980	750	2871.4	5.668- 8.038
5	1550	500	1300	1095	2871.4	7.264-10.560
6	1560	500	1340	1080	2666.3	8.382-14.896
7	1600	500	1260	1052	2871.4	7.238- 9.883
8	1680	500	1330	1066	2871.4	8.850-10.371
9	1650	500	1340	1060	2912.4	7.020- 8.897

Table 3.1B. Glass Melting and Fibre Drawing Parameters.

<u>Sl. No.</u>	<u>Glass</u>	<u><math>T_g</math></u>
1	1	470°C
2	2	470°C
3	3	500°C
4	4	477.5°C
5	5	550°C
6	6	570°C
7	7	590°C
8	8	497°C
9	9	618°C

Table 4.1. Glass Transition Temperatures of Glasses 1 to 9.



# GLASS 1 FIBRES

Cross Head Speed = 0.02 cm/min  
 Chart speed = 2 cm/min  
 Gage length = 2.0 cm

S.No.	Breaking Load (gms)	Chart distance (cm)	Lia. (μm)	$U_1 S \times 10^{-8}$ N/M <sup>2</sup>	$U_1 S \times 10^{-5}$ psi	Strain $\times 10^2$	$E \times 10^{-10}$ N/M <sup>2</sup>	$E$ mpsi
11	2.95	2.9	8.155	5.537	0.803	1.45	3.816	5.537
12	4.35	3.8	8.452	7.603	1.103	1.9	4.001	5.806
13	1.75	1.75	7.677	3.707	0.538	0.875	4.236	6.147
14	4.1	3.9	7.088	10.187	1.478	1.95	5.224	7.580
15	2.9	2.8	8.299	5.256	0.763	1.4	3.754	5.443
16	5.075	2.85	10.429	5.825	0.845	1.425	4.088	5.932
17	4.4	2.1 (1.9cm gage)	9.837	5.677	0.824	1.105	5.135	7.455
18	5.2	4.1	8.077	9.950	1.444	2.05	4.854	7.043
19	2.7	2.1	8.521	4.642	0.674	1.05	4.421	6.415
110	6.7	5.2	8.957	10.427	1.513	2.75	3.791	5.501
111	5.25	4.4	8.232	9.673	1.403	2.2	4.397	6.380
112	2.15	2.8	7.020	5.446	0.790	1.4	3.890	5.646
113	3.05	2.4	8.159	5.720	0.830	1.2	4.767	6.917
114	4.5	3.925	7.324	10.473	1.520	1.903	5.335	7.741
115	4.275	3.8	7.905	8.541	1.239	1.9	4.495	6.523
116	1.775	1.8	7.602	3.835	0.556	0.9	4.261	6.182
117	5.0	4.2	7.786	10.296	1.494	2.1	4.903	7.114
				Average	Average			Average
				1.048				6.435

GLASS 2 FIBRES

Cross Head Speed = 0.02 cm/min  
 Chart speed = 2 cm/min  
 Gage length = 2.0 cm

S.No.	Breaking Load (gms)	Chart distance (cm)	d.a. (μm)	$U_1 S x 10^{-8}$ N/M <sup>2</sup>	$U_1 S x 10^{-5}$ psi	Strain $\times 10^2$	$E x 10^{-10}$ N/M <sup>2</sup>	$\mu$ mpsl
21	7.2	3.4	8.946	11.232	1.630	1.7	6.607	9.587
22	5.1	2.75	8.732	8.351	1.212	1.375	6.073	8.813
23	7.7	3.7	9.847	9.913	1.438	1.85	5.358	7.775
24	5.2	2.6	9.187	7.691	1.116	1.3	5.916	8.584
25	4.25	2.0	9.139	6.352	0.922	1.0	6.352	9.217
26	3.6	3.65	6.400	10.973	1.592	1.825	6.013	8.725
27	6.25	3.55	9.347	8.930	1.296	1.775	5.031	7.300
28	5.4	3.75	7.935	10.706	1.553	1.875	5.710	8.285
29	3.25	3.1	6.742	8.925	1.295	1.55	5.758	8.355
210	4.3	2.95	8.642	7.188	1.043	1.475	4.873	7.071
211	5.2	2.95	9.297	7.510	1.090	1.475	5.092	7.388
212	1.75	2.15	5.525	7.157	1.038	1.075	6.658	9.66
213	3.55	3.85 (1.8 cm gage)	5.842	12.99	1.885	2.14	6.07	8.81
214	2.8	3.7	6.541	8.17	1.185	1.85	4.42	6.41
215	6.5	4.5	8.255	11.91	1.75	2.25	5.293	7.68
216	2.1	3.0	6.096	7.055	1.02	1.5	4.70	6.80
217	8.9	6.6	8.001	17.36	2.519	3.3	5.26	7.63
218	6.5	4.25	8.380	11.55	1.68	2.125	5.44	7.89

....Contd..

CENTRAL LIBRARY  
 59552

GLASS 2 FIBRES (...Contd.)

S.No.	Breaking Load (gms)	Chart dis- tance (cm)	dia. ( $\mu$ m)	UtSx10 <sup>-8</sup> N/M <sup>2</sup>	UtSx10 <sup>-5</sup> psi	Strain x 10 <sup>2</sup>	Ex10 <sup>-10</sup> N/M <sup>2</sup>	$\mu$ mpsl
219	2.05	3.15	5.715	7.836	1.137	1.575	4.975	7.22
220	4.6	6.15	5.715	17.58	2.55	3.075	5.72	8.295
221	4.4	6.4	6.35	13.62	1.977	3.2	4.26	6.176
222	2.2	2.7	5.967	7.71	1.12	1.35	5.71	8.29
223	3.0	5.1	5.334	13.16	1.91	2.55	5.16	7.488
224	3.65	5.2	5.715	13.95	2.02	2.6	5.37	7.79
				Average 1.498				Average 7.969

Table 4.202

# GLASS 3 FIBRES

Cross Head speed = 0.02 cm/min  
 Chart speed = 2 cm/min  
 Gage length = 2.0 cm

S.No.	Breaking Load (gms)	Chart distance (cm)	Dia. (μm)	$UTS \times 10^{-8}$ N/M <sup>2</sup>	$UTS \times 10^{-5}$ psi	Strain $\times 10^2$	$E \times 10^{-10}$ N/M <sup>2</sup>	E mpsi
3 <sub>1</sub>	3.1	3.15	7.004	7.889	1.145	1.575	5.009	7.268
3 <sub>2</sub>	5.7	4.2	9.060	7.756	1.125	2.1	3.693	5.359
3 <sub>3</sub>	8.35	3.95	11.184	8.334	1.209	1.975	4.220	6.123
3 <sub>4</sub>	9.5	4.75	10.770	10.225	1.484	2.375	4.305	6.247
3 <sub>5</sub>	5.4	3.85	8.726	8.854	1.285	1.925	4.500	6.674
3 <sub>6</sub>	4.5	4.75	7.566	9.813	1.424	2.375	4.132	5.995
3 <sub>7</sub>	2.8	3.95	7.499	6.216	0.902	1.975	3.148	4.567
3 <sub>8</sub>	5.275	4.25	8.927	8.263	1.199	2.125	3.888	5.642
3 <sub>9</sub>	3.15	3.25	7.840	6.398	0.928	1.625	3.937	5.715
3 <sub>10</sub>	2.35	1.85 (1.7 cm gage)	7.215	5.635	0.818	1.088	5.179	7.515
3 <sub>11</sub>	5.35	5.0	8.098	10.184	1.478	2.5	4.073	5.911
3 <sub>12</sub>	4.1	4.1	7.925	8.151	1.183	2.05	3.976	5.769
3 <sub>13</sub>	4.15	3.5	8.475	7.214	1.047	1.75	4.122	5.981
3 <sub>14</sub>	4.6	3.9	7.806	9.425	1.368	1.95	4.834	7.013
3 <sub>15</sub>	3.3	3.65	8.089	6.296	0.914	1.825	3.450	5.006
3 <sub>16</sub>	2.85	4.25	7.481	6.357	0.922	2.125	2.992	4.341
3 <sub>17</sub>	3.1	2.7	7.911	6.183	0.897	1.35	4.580	6.640
3 <sub>18</sub>	2.8	2.85	7.696	5.902	0.856	1.425	4.142	6.010

GLASS 3 FIBRES (...Conto.)

S.No.	Breaking load (gms)	Chart dis- tance (cm)	dia. ( $\mu$ m)	$U_1 S \times 10^{-8}$ N/M <sup>2</sup>	$U_1 S \times 10^{-5}$ psi	Strain $\times 10^2$	$E \times 10^{-10}$ N/M <sup>2</sup>	$\sigma$ mpsi
319	3.9	4.4	7.942	7.718	1.199	2.2	3.508	5.09
320	3.35	3.3	7.323	7.798	1.132	1.65	4.726	6.858
321	3.65	4.2	7.470	8.165	1.185	2.1	3.888	5.642
322	7.0	5.05	9.056	10.656	1.546	2.525	4.220	6.123
323	4.175	3.0	9.236	6.110	0.887	1.5	4.073	5.911
324	6.25	4.5	10.097	7.959	1.155	2.25	3.537	5.133
325	5.45	5.2	7.511	12.060	1.750	2.6	4.639	6.731
326	4.45	4.3	7.984	8.716	1.265	2.15	4.054	5.882
327	4.425	4.55	6.622	12.598	1.828	2.275	5.535	8.032
Average					1.190			
								Average 6.044

Table 4.20)

# GLASS 4 FIBRES

Cross Head Speed = 0.02 cm/min  
Chart speed = 2 cm/min  
Gage length = 2.0 cm

S.No.	Breaking Load (gms)	Chart distance (cm)	Dia. (μm)	UTSx10 <sup>-8</sup> N/M <sup>2</sup>	UTSx10 <sup>-5</sup> psi	Strain x 10 <sup>2</sup>	Ex10 <sup>-10</sup> N/M <sup>2</sup>	E mpsi
4 <sub>1</sub>	3.4	4.05	6.499	10.048	1.458	2.025	4.962	7.20
4 <sub>2</sub>	3.825	3.5	6.016	13.192	1.914	1.75	7.538	10.938
4 <sub>3</sub>	3.95	4.0	5.668	15.350	2.227	2.0	7.675	11.136
4 <sub>4</sub>	4.85	2.85	7.833	9.868	1.432	1.425	6.925	10.048
4 <sub>5</sub>	5.125	3.75	7.206	12.320	1.788	1.875	6.571	9.534
4 <sub>6</sub>	4.35	4.1	7.277	10.256	1.488	2.05	5.003	7.259
4 <sub>7</sub>	3.3	3.35	6.570	9.544	1.385	1.675	5.698	8.268
4 <sub>8</sub>	4.2	2.5 (1.85 cm gage)	8.038	8.116	1.178	1.35	5.012	8.723
4 <sub>9</sub>	6.05	5.3 (1.8 cm gage)	7.412	13.747	1.995	2.94	4.676	6.785
4 <sub>10</sub>	4.225	3.55	6.018	14.566	2.114	1.775	8.206	11.900
4 <sub>11</sub>	2.675	2.3	6.246	8.560	1.242	1.15	7.443	10.800
4 <sub>12</sub>	5.3	4.45	5.969	18.57	2.695	2.225	8.346	12.110
4 <sub>13</sub>	5.475	4.5	6.923	14.262	2.069	2.25	6.339	9.198
4 <sub>14</sub>	4.25	3.4	6.223	13.70	1.988	1.7	8.059	11.693
					Average 1.784			Average 9.686

Table 4.204

# GLASS 5 FIBRES

Gross Head Speed = 0.02 cm/min  
Chart speed = 2 cm/min  
Gage length = 2.0 cm

S.No.	Breaking Load (gms)	Chart distance (cm)	Dia. (μm)	UTSx10 <sup>-8</sup> N/m <sup>2</sup>	UTSx10 <sup>-5</sup> psi	Strain x 10 <sup>2</sup>	E <sub>x</sub> 10 <sup>-10</sup> N/m <sup>2</sup>	ε mpsi
51	3.47	2.4	8.278	6.321	0.917	1.2	5.268	7.644
52	4.7	3.25	8.661	7.821	1.135	1.625	4.813	6.984
53	9.6	5.4	7.865	19.373	2.811	2.7	7.175	10.411
54	6.1	2.3	8.484	10.580	1.535	1.15	9.199	13.349
55	6.9	4.4	8.233	12.707	1.844	2.2	5.776	8.381
56	8.35	4.325	7.747	17.369	2.520	2.163	8.03	11.652
57	8.15	3.95	9.056	12.407	1.800	1.975	6.282	9.115
58	6.0	3.7	7.827	12.228	1.774	1.85	6.609	9.590
59	5.4	2.9	7.204	12.770	1.850	1.45	8.81	12.785
510	14.5	4.85	10.566	16.214	2.353	2.425	6.680	9.702
511	4.8	3.0	7.391	10.970	1.592	1.50	7.313	10.612
512	13.1	5.0	9.589	17.786	2.58	2.5	7.114	10.323
513	12.45	4.5	10.057	15.057	2.185	2.25	6.692	9.710
				Average	1.915			Average
								10.020

Table 4.205

GLASS b FIBRES

Cross Head speed = 0.02 cm/min  
 Chart speed = 2 cm/min  
 Gage length = 2.0 cm

S.No.	Breaking Load (gms)	Chart distance (cm)	Dia. (μm)	UTSx10 <sup>-8</sup> N/M <sup>2</sup>	UTSx10 <sup>-5</sup> psi	Strain x 10 <sup>2</sup>	Stress N/M <sup>2</sup>	Stress mpsi
6 <sub>1</sub>	6.1	3.25	8.573	10.363	1.504	1.625	6.377	9.253
6 <sub>2</sub>	28.25	5.35	14.896	15.894	2.306	2.675	5.942	8.622
6 <sub>3</sub>	7.375	3.5	8.653	12.296	1.784	1.75	7.026	10.195
6 <sub>4</sub>	8.95	3.5	9.209	13.176	1.912	1.75	7.529	10.925
6 <sub>5</sub>	17.8	3.9	13.589	12.024	1.746	1.95	6.17	8.955
6 <sub>6</sub>	10.75	2.45	12.836	8.146	1.182	1.225	6.650	9.648
6 <sub>7</sub>	12.95	2.8	12.758	9.933	1.441	1.4	7.095	10.295
6 <sub>8</sub>	9.75	2.85	11.278	9.570	1.389	1.425	6.716	9.745
6 <sub>9</sub>	10.3	2.1	13.449	7.109	1.032	1.05	5.77	9.82
6 <sub>10</sub>	6.5	2.625	8.954	10.121	1.469	1.313	7.708	11.185
6 <sub>11</sub>	8.45	3.0	9.652	11.323	1.643	1.5	7.549	10.953
6 <sub>12</sub>	13.15	2.65	14.224	8.114	1.177	1.325	6.124	8.886
6 <sub>13</sub>	13.3	2.0	14.732	7.650	1.11	1.00	7.65	11.10
6 <sub>14</sub>	8.1	3.85	8.382	14.393	2.088	1.925	7.477	10.849
6 <sub>15</sub>	12.55	2.8	13.411	8.711	1.264	1.4	6.222	9.028
6 <sub>16</sub>	14.3	2.9	12.840	10.828	1.571	1.45	7.468	10.835
				Average	Average			Average
				1.539	1.539			10.02

Table 4.206



# GLASS 7 FIBRES

Cross Head Speed = 0.02 cm/min  
Chart speed = 2 cm/min  
Gage length = 2.0 cm

S.No.	Breaking load (gms)	Chart dis- tance (cm)	Dia. ( $\mu$ m)	UTSx10 <sup>-8</sup> N/M <sup>2</sup>	UTSx10 <sup>-5</sup> psi	Strain x 10 <sup>2</sup>	Ex10 <sup>-10</sup> N/M <sup>2</sup>	E mpsi
7 <sub>1</sub>	11.25	4.45	9.767	14.723	2.136	2.225	0.617	9.601
7 <sub>2</sub>	9.45	3.65	9.546	12.946	1.878	1.825	7.093	10.293
7 <sub>3</sub>	11.35	4.5	9.549	15.54	2.255	2.25	6.907	10.022
7 <sub>4</sub>	4.725	2.2	8.639	7.903	1.147	1.10	7.185	10.425
7 <sub>5</sub>	8.25	4.0	8.015	16.032	2.326	2.0	8.016	11.631
7 <sub>6</sub>	5.375	3.0	7.62	11.556	1.677	1.5	7.704	11.18
7 <sub>7</sub>	6.0	3.25	7.874	12.081	1.753	1.625	7.434	10.787
7 <sub>8</sub>	7.825	3.4	8.306	14.16	2.055	8.867	8.329	12.085
7 <sub>9</sub>	6.85	4.0	7.493	15.23	2.21	2.0	7.615	11.049
7 <sub>10</sub>	6.525	2.55	8.853	10.394	1.508	1.275	8.152	11.829
7 <sub>11</sub>	9.1	5.25	8.192	16.928	2.456	2.625	6.449	9.357
7 <sub>12</sub>	8.05	4.45	7.811	16.472	2.39	2.225	7.403	10.742
7 <sub>13</sub>	5.0	3.3	7.238	11.915	1.729	1.65	7.221	10.478
7 <sub>14</sub>	6.1	3.05	8.171	11.405	1.655	1.525	7.479	10.852
7 <sub>15</sub>	8.0	2.7	9.729	10.552	1.531	1.35	7.817	11.342
7 <sub>16</sub>	11.9	4.05	9.883	15.209	2.207	2.025	7.511	10.898
					Average 1.933			Average 10.786

Table 4.207

# GLASS 8 FIBRES

Cross Head Speed = 0.02 cm/min  
Chart speed = 2 cm/min  
Gage length = 2.0 cm

S.No.	Breaking Load (gms)	Chart distance (cm)	Lia. (μm)	$UTS \times 10^{-8}$ N/M <sup>2</sup>	$UTS \times 10^{-5}$ psi	Strain $\times 10^2$	$E \times 10^{-10}$ N/M <sup>2</sup>	$E$ mpsi
8 <sub>1</sub>	4.0	3.25	9.325	5.743	0.833	1.625	3.534	5.128
8 <sub>2</sub>	2.95	2.3	9.774	3.855	0.559	1.15	3.353	4.865
8 <sub>3</sub>	5.97	4.2	9.102	8.997	1.305	2.1	4.284	6.217
8 <sub>4</sub>	4.7	3.2	9.468	6.546	0.950	1.6	4.091	5.930
8 <sub>5</sub>	2.45	2.3	9.302	3.489	0.506	1.15	3.034	4.403
8 <sub>6</sub>	4.3	3.1	9.495	5.954	0.864	1.55	3.841	5.574
8 <sub>7</sub>	4.975	3.25	9.845	6.408	0.930	1.625	3.944	5.722
8 <sub>8</sub>	4.2	3.9	9.576	5.718	0.830	1.95	2.932	4.254
8 <sub>9</sub>	3.8	3.05	10.106	4.645	0.674	1.525	3.046	4.419
8 <sub>10</sub>	5.5	3.2	9.955	6.928	1.005	1.6	4.330	6.283
8 <sub>11</sub>	3.225	2.7	9.384	4.572	0.603	1.35	3.387	4.914
8 <sub>12</sub>	6.2	4.15	9.014	9.527	1.382	2.075	4.591	6.00
8 <sub>13</sub>	3.25	2.85	8.850	5.182	0.752	1.425	3.037	5.277
8 <sub>14</sub>	5.25	4.45	10.371	6.094	0.842	2.225	2.739	3.974
8 <sub>15</sub>	3.5	2.5	9.308	5.043	0.732	1.25	4.034	5.854
8 <sub>16</sub>	3.25	2.3	9.881	4.156	0.603	1.15	3.614	5.244
8 <sub>17</sub>	3.15	2.6	9.664	4.211	0.611	1.3	3.239	4.699
				Average	Average			Average
				0.826	0.826			5.250

Table 4.208

# CLASS 9.11.10.15

Cross head speed = 0.02 cm/min  
 Chart speed = 2 cm/min  
 Gage length = 2.0 cm.

S.No.	Breaking Load (gms)	Chart distance (cm)	dia. (μm)	UTSx10 <sup>-8</sup> N/M <sup>2</sup>	UTSx10 <sup>-5</sup> psi	Strain x 10 <sup>-5</sup> N/M <sup>2</sup>	E x 10 <sup>-10</sup> N/M <sup>2</sup>	mpsi
91	15.1	6.3	8.586	22.184	2.219	3.15	7.043	10.219
92	9.85	5.35	8.435	17.304	2.511	2.675	6.469	9.386
93	8.0	4.05	8.692	13.219	1.918	2.025	6.528	9.472
94	7.1	3.5	7.874	14.296	2.074	1.75	8.169	11.855
95	6.5	4.1	8.052	12.516	1.816	2.05	6.105	8.859
96	10.85	5.5	8.306	19.63	2.85	2.75	7.138	10.358
97	10.25	7.15	7.671	21.740	3.155	3.575	6.083	8.820
98	9.85	5.3	8.259	18.028	2.616	2.65	6.841	9.920
99	8.525	6.35	7.906	17.027	2.471	3.175	5.363	7.782
910	8.1	4.2	8.897	12.776	1.854	2.1	6.084	8.828
911	13.5	7.1	8.509	23.277	3.378	3.55	6.557	9.514
912	8.2	5.0	7.959	16.160	2.345	2.5	6.464	9.379
913	8.775	4.8	7.741	18.282	2.653	2.4	7.618	11.053
914	8.675	4.2	7.62	18.652	2.706	2.1	8.882	12.888
915	10.25	4.85	7.811	20.973	3.043	2.425	8.649	12.549
				Average	2.574			Average
								10.060

Table 4.209

# GLASS 9 FIBERS

Cross Head Speed = 0.02 cm/min  
Chart speed = 2 cm/min  
Gage length = 2.0 cm  
Dimensions measured by Optical  
Microscope

S.No.	Breaking Load (gms)	Chart dis- tance (cm)	dia. (μm)	UTSx10 <sup>-8</sup> N/M <sup>2</sup>	UTSx10 <sup>-5</sup>		Strain		E <sub>x</sub> 10 <sup>-10</sup>		E <sub>p</sub> mpsi
					psi	x 10 <sup>2</sup>	x 10 <sup>2</sup>	N/M <sup>2</sup>	psi	mpsi	
91	13.10	6.30	10.390	15.149	2.198	3.15	3.15	4.810	6.98	6.98	
92	9.85	5.35	10.520	11.110	1.610	2.675	2.675	4.150	6.02	6.02	
93	8.00	4.05	10.520	9.024	1.309	2.025	2.025	4.460	6.47	6.47	
94	7.10	3.50	10.179	8.550	1.240	1.75	1.75	4.886	7.09	7.09	
95	6.50	4.10	9.980	8.150	1.180	2.05	2.05	5.980	5.77	5.77	
96	10.85	5.50	10.425	12.460	1.808	2.75	2.75	4.530	6.57	6.57	
97	10.25	7.15	9.737	13.497	1.958	3.575	3.575	3.780	5.48	5.48	
98	9.85	5.30	11.015	10.13	1.47	2.65	2.65	3.820	5.55	5.55	
99	8.525	6.35	9.835	11.000	1.597	3.175	3.175	3.400	5.03	5.03	
910	8.10	4.20	10.769	8.72	1.265	2.1	2.1	4.150	6.03	6.03	
911	13.50	7.10	10.425	15.507	2.25	3.55	3.55	4.368	6.34	6.34	
912	8.20	5.00	10.520	9.250	1.340	2.5	2.5	3.700	5.37	5.37	
913	8.775	4.80	9.245	12.482	1.860	2.4	2.4	5.200	7.55	7.55	
914	8.675	4.20	10.294	10.220	1.480	2.1	2.1	4.870	7.06	7.06	
915	10.250	4.85	10.327	11.999	1.74	2.425	2.425	4.950	7.18	7.18	
Average					1.621						Average
											6.299

Table 4.210

GLASS 7 FIBRES

Cross Head Speed = 0.05 cm/min  
 Chart speed = 2 cm/min  
 Gage length = 5.0 cm

S.No.	Breaking Load (gms)	Chart distance (cm)	dia. (um)	UTSx10 <sup>-8</sup> N/M <sup>2</sup>	UTSx10 <sup>-5</sup> psi	Strain x 10 <sup>2</sup>	Ex10 <sup>-10</sup> N/M <sup>2</sup>	$\sigma$ mpsi
7 <sub>1</sub>	4.37	2.1	8.169	8.170	1.186	1.05	7.781	11.291
7 <sub>2</sub>	7.007	2.85	8.870	11.114	1.613	1.425	7.799	11.316
7 <sub>3</sub>	7.154	3.3	8.170	13.373	1.940	1.65	8.105	11.760
7 <sub>4</sub>	6.958	2.3	9.920	8.822	1.280	1.15	7.671	11.131
7 <sub>5</sub>	5.782	2.9	7.937	11.454	1.662	1.45	7.899	11.462
7 <sub>6</sub>	8.379	2.7	9.959	10.541	1.529	1.35	7.808	11.329
7 <sub>7</sub>	5.488	2.8	8.287	9.973	1.447	1.4	7.123	10.336
7 <sub>8</sub>	6.370	3.3	8.014	12.376	1.796	1.65	7.501	10.884
7 <sub>9</sub>	6.958	3.8	7.975	13.651	1.981	1.90	7.165	10.425
7 <sub>10</sub>	5.096	2.35	8.753	8.300	1.204	1.175	7.064	10.250
					Average 1.564			Average 11.02

Table 4.211

# GLASS 9 FIBRES

Chart speed = 2 cm/min  
Gage length = 5.0 cm

S.No.	Breaking load (gms)	Chart dis- tance (cm)	Cross-Head Speed (cm/min)	dia. ( $\mu$ m)	$U_1 S \times 10^{-8}$ $N/M^2$	$U_1 S \times 10^{-5}$ psi	strain $\times 10^2$	$\epsilon \times 10^{-10}$ $N/M^2$	$\epsilon$ mpsi
91	4.3	4.8	0.02	8.939	6.714	0.974	0.96	6.994	10.148
92	10.143	15.2	0.02	8.370	18.060	2.622	3.04	5.943	8.623
93	8.775	4.2	0.05	8.126	16.580	2.406	2.1	7.895	11.456
94	6.075	2.65	0.05	8.370	10.821	1.570	1.375	7.870	11.419
95	12.495	3.05	0.05	9.895	10.975	1.595	1.525	7.197	10.445
96	6.125	3.55	0.05	8.208	11.345	1.646	1.775	6.392	9.274
97	3.528	1.5	0.05	8.736	5.768	0.637	0.75	7.691	11.160
98	5.802	2.85	0.05	8.289	10.536	1.529	1.425	7.394	10.728
99	5.488	2.7	0.05	8.370	9.776	1.418	1.35	7.241	10.507
910	5.096	2.35	0.05	8.736	8.332	1.209	1.175	7.091	10.289
911	9.30	4.25	0.05	8.825	14.901	2.162	2.125	7.012	10.175
						Average			Average
						1.633			10.384

Table 4.212

Chart speed = 2 cm/min  
 Cross Head speed = 0.02 cm/min  
 Load cell used = 0.50 kg

Glass (sample)	L cms	b cms	d cms	breaking Load (kg)	Rupture Modulus $\times 10^{-8}$ N/M <sup>2</sup>	$E_b \times 10^{-10}$ N/M <sup>2</sup>	$E_b$ mpsi	Average Rupture Modulus $\times 10^{-8}$ N/M <sup>2</sup>	Average $E_b$ in mpsi
1(i)	1.5	0.440	0.408	24.25	0.730	5.079	7.369		
1(ii)	1.5	0.454	0.330	19.20	0.856	4.920	7.138		
1(iii)	1.5	0.430	0.410	24.80	0.757	5.695	8.263	0.762	7.749
1(iv)	1.5	0.470	0.430	20.25	0.514*	6.612	9.593		
1(v)	1.5	0.430	0.280	10.75	0.703	4.395	6.377		
2(i)	2.0	0.500	0.500	23.75	0.559	5.860	8.503		
2(ii)	2.0	0.450	0.350	10.80	0.576	-	-	0.691	7.533
2(iii)	1.5	0.510	0.338	25.80	0.976	5.349	7.762		
2(iv)	1.5	0.526	0.420	25.00	0.594	4.515	6.552		
2(v)	1.5	0.542	0.486	43.50	0.749	5.041	7.315		
4(i)	1.5	0.470	0.378	19.80	0.650	-	-		
4(ii)	1.5	0.480	0.406	27.60	0.763	7.513	10.901		
4(iii)	1.5	0.506	0.358	15.00	0.510	6.566	9.527	0.614	9.388
4(iv)	1.5	0.538	0.472	31.50	0.580	6.341	9.201		
4(v)	2.5	0.536	0.476	18.75	0.567	5.461	7.924		
8(i)	2.5	0.606	0.534	25.60	0.544	3.719	5.396		
8(ii)	2.5	0.508	0.528	22.15	0.575	4.685	6.798	0.514	5.961
8(iii)	2.5	0.598	0.534	19.60	0.422	3.921	5.630		

Values with asterix against them are not included in the average.

Table 4.51

Chart speed = 2 cm/min  
 Cross beam Speed = 0.02 cm/min  
 Load cell used = 0-50 Kg

Glass (sample)	L cms	b cms	a cms	Breaking Load (Kg)	Rupture Modulus $\times 10^{-8}$ N/M <sup>2</sup>	$E_b \times 10^{-10}$ N/M <sup>2</sup>	$f_b$ mps	Average rupture modulus $\times 10^{-8}$ N/M <sup>2</sup>	Average $E_b$ in mps
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
5(i)	1.5	0.436	0.406	25.50	0.782	9.865	14.314*		
5(ii)	1.5	0.408	0.342	13.10	0.605	5.722	8.274		
5(iii)	1.5	0.454	0.390	26.80	0.586	-	-	0.748	10.03
5(iv)	2.5	0.520	0.508	29.25	0.801	7.563	10.974		
5(v)	2.5	0.562	0.476	28.00	0.808	6.168	8.950		
5(vi)	2.5	0.558	0.464	20.75	0.635	7.020	10.186		
5(vii)	2.5	0.464	0.472	21.00	0.747	8.099	11.752		
6(i)	2.5	0.492	0.462	24.40	0.854	6.830	9.910		
6(ii)	2.5	0.458	0.432	17.90	0.770	7.513	10.901	0.794	10.456
6(iii)	2.5	0.458	0.486	17.25	0.586*	7.178	10.415		
6(iv)	2.5	0.402	0.486	22.50	0.758	7.303	10.596		
7(i)	2.5	0.500	0.420	15.40	0.642	7.137	10.356		
7(ii)	2.5	0.512	0.472	26.50	0.854	6.304	9.147	0.703	9.568
7(iii)	2.5	0.484	0.390	19.50	0.973	6.984	10.134		
7(iv)	2.0	0.476	0.412	18.20	0.662	5.952	8.630		

...Contd.



1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
9(i)	1.5	0.460	0.450	26.6	0.630	-	-		
9(ii)	2.5	0.542	0.428	21.25	0.787	6.995	10.150		
9(iii)	2.5	0.450	0.474	19.30	0.702	5.612	8.143	0.700	10.022
9(iv)	2.5	0.550	0.540	33.00	0.756	8.114	11.773		
9(v)	2.5	0.644	0.508	32.70	0.723	-	-		
9(vi)	2.5	0.452	0.480	17.00	0.600	-	-		

Values with asterix against them are not included in the average.

Table 4.52

Glass	Angle $2\theta$ in degrees	$d$ ( $\text{\AA}$ )	$I/I_1$
7 (Bulk)	38.24	2.35166	100.00
	44.36	2.04038	37.11
	64.56	1.44232	23.71
	77.48	1.23090	27.84
	81.40	1.18124	7.28
6 (Bulk)	38.08	2.3610	100.00
	44.24	2.0460	32.56
	64.48	1.4440	20.93
	77.38	1.2320	27.13
7 (Fibres)	38.08	2.3612	100.00
	44.20	2.0474	70.00
	77.60	1.2293	32.00

Table 4.41

Glass Fibre	Average $U^* S \times 10^{-5}$ (psi)	Average percent volume fraction of the dis- persed phase	Average size R, of the dis- persed phase ( $\text{\AA}$ )	Mean free path for crack propagation, ( $\text{\AA}$ )	$\sqrt{\frac{1}{N}} \times 10^2$ ( $\text{\AA}$ ) <sup>-2</sup>
1	1.048	26.190	315.04	1176.50	2.916
2	1.498	40.278	133.455	263.84	6.156
3	1.190	22.421	127.44	587.958	4.124
4	1.784	38.889	97.149	203.55	7.009
8	0.826				
Bulk Glass	Average Rupture Modulus $\times 10^8$ in <sup>2</sup>	Average percent volume fraction of the dis- persed phase	Average size R, of the dis- persed phase ( $\text{\AA}$ )	Mean free path for crack propagation, ( $\text{\AA}$ )	$\sqrt{\frac{1}{N}} \times 10^2$ ( $\text{\AA}$ ) <sup>-2</sup>
1	0.762	41.666	122.749	229.138	6.606
2	0.691	53.974	107.663	278.98	5.987
4	0.614	25.992	168.766	640.713	3.951
8	0.514				

Fig. 4.61

Radius of Ring $r_n$ (cms)	$r_n^2$	$r_n^2/r_1^2$	$\frac{h^2+k^2+l^2}{h_1^2+k_1^2+l_1^2} \left( \frac{t.c.}{c} \right)$	$h \ k \ l$	Camera constant $\lambda L$ (Å cm)	$a_{hkl}$	$d_{hkl}$ (silver)
1.150	1.323	1.000	1.000	111		2.357	2.359
1.325	1.756	1.327	1.333	200		2.045	2.044
1.880	3.534	2.672	2.667	220		1.441	1.445
2.220	4.928	3.725	3.667	311	2.710	1.221	1.231
2.350	5.406	4.085	4.000	222		1.153	1.180
2.950	8.703	6.578	6.333	331		0.919	0.938
3.025	9.151	6.917	6.067	420		0.896	0.914

Table 4.62: SAD analysis of photograph 4.619.

Glass	Distances of spots from centre $r_n$ (cms)	Camera constant (L) Å cm	$d_{n1}$ (Å)
2 Fibres	1.30	2.9631	2.772
	1.70		1.715
	1.75		1.697
	1.95		1.52
	2.30		1.273
	2.35		1.261
	2.99		0.991
	3.025		0.980

Table 4.63

Glass	Diameter of Rings (cms)	Radius of ring $r_n$ (cms)	Camera constant (L) Å cm	$d_{n1}$ (Å)
5 Fibres	2.15	1.075	2.9631	2.76
	2.48	1.24		2.39
	3.30	1.65		1.736
	3.725	1.59		1.59
	3.90	1.80		1.52
	4.35	2.175		1.36

Table 4.64

Glass	Distance of spots from centre $r_n$ (cms)	Camera constant ( $L$ ) in cm.	$d_{min}$ ( $\mu$ )
	0.675		4.55
	1.075		2.76
	1.20		2.47
6 Fibres	1.24	2.9651	2.39
	1.625		1.82
	1.875		1.58
	2.175		1.36

Table 4.65

## A.S.T.M. DATA

Bismuth Bi, Hexagonal					
$a$ ( $\text{\AA}$ )	$I/I_1$	hkl	$a$ ( $\text{\AA}$ )	$I/I_1$	hkl
3.95	9	003	1.1843	2	028
3.74	3	011	1.1399	4	119
3.28	100	102	1.1368	4	220
2.39	40	014	1.1179	2	127
2.273	41	110	1.0932	4	306
2.030	8	105	1.0738	5	132
1.976	3	006	1.0501	2	218
1.970	10	113	1.0399	2	1.0.11
1.941	1	201	1.0247	3	314
1.868	23	022	0.9920	1	135
1.639	9	204	0.9854	3	226
1.556	6	017	0.9709	2	402
1.515	2	025	0.9455	2	0.2.11
1.491	13	116	0.9301	4	309
1.387	4	108	0.9276	2	1.2.10
1.330	11	124	0.9178	2	317
1.319	1	009	0.9065	2	1.1.12
1.312	6	300	0.8928	2	322
1.284	2	207			
1.261	2	215			
1.246	1	303			


Table 4.56

A.S.T.M. DATA

Calcium Magnesium Silicate Ca <sub>2</sub> MgSi <sub>2</sub> O <sub>7</sub> (Tetragonal)			Akermanite or Melillite 2CaO·MgO·2SiO <sub>2</sub>			Silver (f.c.c.) Ag		
a (Å)	I/I <sub>1</sub>	hkl	a (Å)	I/I <sub>1</sub>	hkl	a (Å)	I/I <sub>1</sub>	hkl
4.22	30	101	1.76	80	312	2.359	100	111
3.72	50	111	1.73	50	331	2.044	40	200
3.51	30	210	1.67	20	003	1.445	25	311
3.09	70	201	1.66	20	421	1.231	26	311
2.87	100	211	1.64	50	322	1.1796	12	222
2.51	20	002	1.60	50	113	1.0215	4	400
2.48	70	310	1.54	30	203	0.9375	15	311
2.43	50	221	1.52	30	412	0.9137	12	420
2.39	60	102	1.51	60	213	0.8341	13	422
2.32	60	301	1.49	30	332			
2.28	50	112	1.47	50	511			
2.22	20	311	1.46	20	520			
2.11	20	202	1.44)	60	(422			
2.04	70	212	1.43)	50	(223			
2.00	30	321	1.41	50	303			
1.96	60	400	1.40	70	521			
1.90	60	410	1.39	50	440			
1.86	30	222	1.39	20	313			
1.85	60	330						
1.78	60	411						


Table 4.67





**FIG. 3.2**

**HIGH ALUMINA BUSHING USED FOR DRAWING THE FIBRES.**






Fig. 3.4 JIG USED FOR DETERMINATION OF RUPTURE MODULUS AND YOUNG'S MODULUS IN BENDING OF BULK GLASSES.




Fig. 4.1a




Fig. 4.1b





Fig. 4.21





Fig. 4.22





Fig. 4-23





Fig. 4.24







Fig. 4-25





Fig. 4.26





Fig. 4.27





Fig. 4.28





Fig. 4.29




Fig. 4.31






Fig. 4






Glass 7 (bulk)  
CPS = 100  
Time constant = 8

Relative intensity





Glass 7 Fibres  
CPS = 500  
Time constant = 2

Relative intensity

77.6


80

75

70

65

60









Fig 5.61




4.51  
Magnification = 300 X




4.52  
Magnification = 300 X




4.53  
Magnification = 750 X




4.54  
Magnification = 750 X



4.55  
Magnification = 750 X



4.601  
Magnification = 104230 X



4.602  
Magnification = 169041




4.603  
Magnification = 169484 X




4.604  
Magnification = 58404 X




4.605  
Magnification = 111133 X




4.606  
Magnification = 169484 X




4.607  
Magnification = 111133 X




4.608  
Magnification = 80779 X




4.609  
Magnification = 109752 X



4.610  
Magnification = 180637 X  
Region of Diffraction 4.619




4.611  
Magnification = 61522 X  
Region of Diffraction 4.616



4.612  
Magnification = 36584 X  
Region of Diffraction 4.615







4-613

Magnification  $\approx 62690\times$ 


4-614

Magnification  $\approx 75327\times$   
Region of vibration 4-618

4-617




4-615




4-618



4 616



4-617




4.701

Magnification = 5938 X




4.702

Magnification = 7731 X




4.703

Magnification = 13901 X




4.704

Magnification = 28319 X




4.705

Magnification = 7533 X



4.706

Magnification = 2236 X




4.707  
Magnification = 14623 X



4.708  
Magnification = 14442 X



4.710  
Magnification = 2028 X



4.709  
Magnification = 18064 X

## Chapter 6

### CONCLUSIONS

The following conclusions can be drawn from this study:

1. Bismuth and silver can be incorporated fairly easily into the glass matrix, during the ~~drawing~~<sup>melting</sup> process itself.
2. Fibres can be drawn without much difficulty from all the nine compositions.
3. All the metal containing glasses and glass fibres have a crystalline phase as is evident from TEM, Optical Microscope and x-ray diffraction studies. The crystalline phase is Bismuth in the case of the Bismuth containing glasses and glass fibres and is silver and calcium magnesium silicate in the silver series of glasses and fibres. The base glasses show no evidence of any crystalline phase.
4. The micro-structure in Bismuth containing glasses and glass fibres consists of a distribution of dark spheres in the glassy matrix. The spheres do not consist solely of Bismuth but probably contain some Alkali ions as well. Feeble diffraction spots are obtainable from these spheres and intense spots are obtained on subjecting the spheres to electron bombardment in the TEM. Diffraction spots are more intense in patchy regions.

In the silver glasses and glass fibres, the crystalline phase is not always spherical in shape. Here SAD is obtained from both spherical and patchy regions.

5. Optical microscopic evidence shows glasses 6 and 7 and glass fibres 5, 6 and 7 to be crystallized. The crystalline phase is relatively coarse grained but uniformly distributed in glasses 6 and 7 and is not quite spherical in shape.

In glass fibres 5, 6 and 7 the crystalline phase shows up as streaks along the fibre axis.

6. DTA studies show that the introduction of  $\text{Ag}_2\text{O}$  and  $\text{Bi}_2\text{O}_3$  into the corresponding base glass compositions results in a lowering of the glass transition temperature.

The lowering is more for the silver glasses than for the Bismuth ones.

These oxides probably act as network modifiers and render the glass network less rigid.

7. The tensile strengths and Young's Moduli of Bismuth containing glasses and glass fibres are higher than the corresponding values for the base glass. Strengthening is attributable mainly to modulus enhancement and flaw size limitation. Rupture Moduli of silver containing glasses are higher than those of the base glass. Here, there is no

modulus enhancement and strengthening is due mainly to flaw size limitation and may be in a certain measure to induced thermo-mechanical compressive stresses.

Strengths of silver containing glass fibres are lower than those of the base glass fibres. This is because the pointed shape of the crystalline phase in these fibres leads to stress concentrating effects.

8. The effect of flaw density and the 'size effect' in metal containing glass fibres is much less than that in the base glass fibres.

9. Fracture surface replicas of metal containing glasses show a much higher degree of surface roughness than those of the base glasses. Replicas of glasses 6 and 7 also show fracture steps; which are a clear indication of the fact that the crack front is interacting with the dispersed particles.

## LIST OF REFERENCES

1. T.K. Gupta, J. Mat. Sc., 2, 1585-1589, (1974).
2. D.P.H. Hasselman and R.H. Fulrath, J. Amer. Ceram. Soc. 49, 63-72 (1966).
3. A.A. Griffith, Phil. Trans. R. Soc., London, Ser. A., 221 [4], 163-190, (1920).
4. M.F. Lange, Phil. Mag. 22, [179], 983-992, (1970).
5. A.P. Borom, J. Amer. Ceram. Soc. 60, [1-2], 17-21, (1977).
6. R.H. Doremus and A.I. Turkalo, J. Mat. Sc., 11, Part 1, 903, (1976).
7. D.H. Koshavaram, M.Tech. Thesis, Materials Science Program, IIT Kanpur, Aug. 1978.
8. D. Chakravorty, G.D. Vaidhani and G.K. Mehta, J. Mat. Sc. 13, 1433-1442, (1978).
9. S. Chakrabarti, M.Tech. Thesis, Materials Science Program, IIT Kanpur, 1979.
10. D. Chakravorty, A.K. Bandyopadhyay and T.I. Nagosh, J. Phys. D: Appl. Phys., 10, 2077-2087, (1977).
11. S. Chakrabarti, M.Tech. Thesis, Materials Science Program, IIT Kanpur, 1979.
12. W.L. Thomas, Phys. Chem. Glasses, 1, 1-18, (1960).
13. P. Hing and D.W. McMillan, J. Mat. Sc. 9, 1041-1043, (1973).



A59552

Date Slip A59552

This book is to be returned on the  
date last stamped.

.....	.....
.....	.....
.....	.....
.....	.....
.....	.....
.....	.....
.....	.....
.....	.....
.....	.....
.....	.....
.....	.....
.....	.....

CD 6.72.9

MSP-1979-M-VEN-FRA